arXiv:1512.07570v1 [math.AT] 23 Dec 2015

RIGHT BOUSFIELD LOCALIZATION AND OPERADIC ALGEBRAS

DAVID WHITE AND DONALD YAU

ABSTRACT. It is well known that under some general conditions right Bousfield localization exists. We provide general conditions under which right Bousfield localization yields a monoidal model category. Then we address the questions of when this monoidal model structure on a right Bousfield localization induces a model structure on the category of algebras over a colored operad and when a right Bousfield localization preserves colored operadic algebras. We give numerous applications, to topological spaces, equivariant spaces, chain complexes, stable module categories, and to the category of small categories. We recover a wide range of classical results as special cases of our theory, and prove several new preservation results.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
2. Colored Operads 3
3. Existence of Right Bousfield Localization 8
4. Monoidality in Right Bousfield Localization 11
5. Model Structure on Algebras in Right Bousfield Localization 15
6. Preservation of Algebras Under Right Bousfield Localization 19
7. Entrywise Colocal Colored Operads 22
8. Σ-Cofibrant Colored Operads in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ 24
9. Application: Spaces 27
10. Application: Equivariant Spaces 30
11. Application: Chain Complexes 33
12. Application: Stable Module Category 38
13. Application: Small Categories 41
References 41

1. Introduction

The CW Approximation Theorem is a fundamental result in homotopy theory. It allows us to work with CW complexes without losing information, up to weak homotopy equivalence. This result is one of a suite of similar results, and all are examples of right Bousfield localization [Hir03], also called cellularization. Examples include A-cellular homotopy theory in topological spaces or simplicial sets [Cha96], n-connected covers and Postnikov pieces [Nof99], analogous constructions in the category of small categories and in the category of simplicial abelian groups, point-set models in chain complexes and R-modules for localizing subcategories in the derived category of R and the stable module category of R, and family model structures in equivariant homotopy theory (see section 9).

While much work has been done to understand how much structure is preserved by cellularization [CCS07], [MM97], [CPS04], [Nof99], little is understood. In this paper, we find conditions under which right Bousfield localization preserves algebraic structure as encoded by a colored operad. We then prove that these new conditions are satisfied in the examples of interest, and provide specific preservation results about commonly used operads.

Operads are used to encode algebraic structure in general symmetric monoidal categories, and hence have become central to modern algebraic topology. Operads have also been applied to deformation theory and mathematical physics [MSS02], in gauge theory and symplectic geometry, in representation theory and graph cohomology [Fre10], and in Goodwillie calculus.

In recent years, the importance of *colored* operads has become clear, e.g. in [BM07], [YJ15], and [BB14]. Colored operads encode even more general algebraic structures, including the category of operads itself, other categories which encode algebraic structure (e.g. modular operads, higher operads, colored operads), morphisms between algebras over an operad, modules over an operad, other enriched categories, and diagrams in such categories. Colored operads have been applied in enriched category theory, factorization homology, higher category theory (leading to ∞-operads), and topological quantum field theories.

Our setting in this paper is a monoidal model category $\mathcal{M}$, a set of objects K (the cells we want to build things out of), and a right Bousfield localization functor $R_K\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$. As a category, $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is the same as $\mathcal{M}$, hence is monoidal, but the model structure is different, and it is not automatic that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ will be a monoidal model category; i.e., the pushout product axiom could fail in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. In order to prove our preservation results, we will need to bring homotopy into the realm of colored operads by building model structures and semi-model structures on categories of algebras over operads. Such structures provide a powerful computational tool which has been crucial in many of the applications above, and are therefore of independent interest.

In Section 2 we provide definitions and notations concerning colored operads. In Section 3 we review right Bousfield localization. We assume the reader is familiar with the basics of model categories (an excellent overview is [Hov99]), and we encourage the reader to proceed with a copy of [Hir03] near at hand. In Section 4 we define the notion of a monoidal right Bousfield localization, dualizing [Whi14b], and we provide an easy to check condition guaranteeing that a right Bousfield localization $R_K\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the pushout product axiom. In Section 5 we build our model structures on categories of algebras taken in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. In Section 6 we dualize our general preservation results from [WY15]. In Sections 7 and 8 we derive specific preservation results, often with easier to check hypotheses. Finally, in Sections 9–13 we apply our results to numerous examples of interest, including spaces, chain complexes, R-modules, small categories, and equivariant spaces.

2. Colored Operads

Assumption 2.1. Fix a symmetric monoidal closed category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I, \mathrm{Hom})$ with all small limits and colimits, initial object $\varnothing$, and terminal object $*$.

Let us first recall some notations regarding colors from [YJ15].

Definition 2.2. Fix a non-empty set $\mathfrak{C}$ once and for all, whose elements are called *colors*.

(1) A $\mathfrak{C}$-*profiles* is a finite sequence of elements $\underline{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m)$ in $\mathfrak{C}$. The empty $\mathfrak{C}$-profile is denoted $\varnothing$. Write $|\underline{c}| = m$ for the *length* of a profile $\underline{c}$.
(2) The set of all $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles is denoted by $\mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C})$.
(3) If $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and $\underline{b}$ are $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles, then a *left permutation* $\sigma : \underline{a} \longrightarrow \underline{b}$ is a permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ such that
$$\sigma\underline{a} = (a_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma^{-1}(m)}) = \underline{b}$$
This necessarily implies $|\underline{a}| = |\underline{b}| = m$. A left permutation is also called a *map*.
(4) The *groupoid of* $\mathfrak{C}$-*profiles*, with left permutations as the isomorphisms, is denoted by $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$. The opposite groupoid $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}^{\mathrm{op}}$ is regarded as the groupoid of $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles with *right permutations*
$$\underline{a}\sigma = (a_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(m)})$$
as isomorphisms.
(5) The *orbit* of a profile $\underline{a}$ is denoted by $[\underline{a}]$. The maximal connected subgroupoid of $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$ containing $\underline{a}$ is written as $\Sigma_{[\underline{a}]}$. Its objects are the left permutations of $\underline{a}$. There is a decomposition
$$\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}} \cong \coprod_{[\underline{a}] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}} \Sigma_{[\underline{a}]}, \tag{2.2.1}$$
where there is one coproduct summand for each orbit $[\underline{a}]$ of a $\mathfrak{C}$-profile.

(6) A $\mathfrak{C}$-*colored object in* $\mathcal{C}$ is an object in the product category

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{C}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{C}.$$

A typical $\mathfrak{C}$-colored object X is also written as $\{X_a\}$ with $X_a \in \mathcal{C}$ for each color a.

(7) A $\mathfrak{C}$-colored object X is said to be *concentrated at* $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ if $X_d = \varnothing$ for all colors $d \neq c$. A map of $\mathfrak{C}$-colored objects is said to be *concentrated at* $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ if both its domain and codomain are concentrated at c.

(8) The category of $\mathfrak{C}$-*colored symmetric sequences in* C is the diagram category

$$\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathfrak{C}}.$$

(9) The category of $\mathfrak{C}$-*colored sequences in* C is the diagram category

$$\mathsf{Seq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{C}^{\mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C}) \times \mathfrak{C}} = \prod_{\mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C}) \times \mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{C}.$$

(10) A typical $\mathfrak{C}$-colored (symmetric) sequence is also written as $\{X\binom{d}{\underline{c}}\}$ with $X\binom{d}{\underline{c}} \in \mathcal{C}$ for $d \in \mathfrak{C}$ and $\underline{c} \in \mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C})$.

(11) Suppose $k \geq 0$. A $\mathfrak{C}$-colored (symmetric) sequence X is said to be *concentrated at* k if, for $d \in \mathfrak{C}$ and $\underline{c} \in \mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C})$,

$$|\underline{c}| \neq k \quad \text{implies} \quad X\binom{d}{\underline{c}} = \varnothing$$

Remark 2.3. (1) A $\mathfrak{C}$-colored (symmetric) sequence concentrated at 0 is equivalent to a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored object.

(2) Since there is a coproduct decomposition

$$\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathfrak{C} \cong \coprod_{d \in \mathfrak{C}} \coprod_{[\underline{c}] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}} \Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \{d\},$$

there is a product decomposition

$$\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C}) \cong \prod_{d \in \mathfrak{C}} \prod_{[\underline{c}] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}} \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \{d\}} \cong \prod_{d \in \mathfrak{C}} \prod_{[\underline{c}] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}} \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}^{\mathrm{op}}}. \tag{2.3.1}$$

If $X \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$, then a typical component with respect to this decomposition is written as

$$X\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]} \in \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \{d\}}.$$

A $\mathfrak{C}$-colored symmetric sequence is the $\mathfrak{C}$-colored version of a 1-colored symmetric sequence [Har10b] (3.1).

(3) Suppose $\mathcal{C}$ is a cofibrantly generated model category. Then by the decomposition (2.3.1) and [Hir03] (11.1.10 and 11.6.1), the category $\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$ inherits from $\mathcal{C}$ a cofibrantly generated model category structure, in which weak equivalences and fibrations are defined entrywise in $\mathcal{C}$. Likewise, the category $\mathsf{Seq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$ inherits from $\mathcal{C}$ a cofibrantly generated model category structure in which fibrations, cofibrations, and weak equivalences are all defined entrywise in $\mathcal{C}$.

The following colimit construction is needed to define the colored version of the circle product.

Definition 2.4. Suppose G is a finite non-empty connected groupoid, $X \in \mathcal{C}^{G^{\mathrm{op}}}$, and $Y \in \mathcal{C}^{G}$. Define

$$X \underset{G}{\otimes} Y = \operatorname{colim}\left[G^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\Delta} G^{\mathrm{op}} \times G^{\mathrm{op}} \cong G^{\mathrm{op}} \times G \xrightarrow{X \times Y} \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathcal{C} \right]. \tag{2.4.1}$$

We now recall from [WY15] the colored circle product, the monoids with respect to which are $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operads.

Definition 2.5. Suppose:

- $A, B \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$, and $Y \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{C}}$;
- $d \in \mathfrak{C}$, $\underline{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_m) \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$, and $[\underline{b}] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is an orbit.

(1) Define $Y^{\otimes[\underline{b}]} \in \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma_{[\underline{b}]}}$ as the diagram with values

$$Y^{\otimes[\underline{b}]}(\underline{b}') = Y^{\otimes \underline{b}'} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=\!=} Y_{b'_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes Y_{b'_n} \tag{2.5.1}$$

if $\underline{b}' = (b'_1, \ldots, b'_n) \in \Sigma_{[\underline{b}]}$. The structure maps in the diagram $Y^{\otimes[\underline{b}]}$ are given by permutation of the tensor factors.

(2) Define the object $B^{\otimes \underline{c}} \in \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{\mathfrak{C}}}$ as having the $[\underline{b}]$-component

$$B^{\otimes \underline{c}}([\underline{b}]) = \coprod_{\substack{\{[\underline{b}_j] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}\}_{1 \le j \le m} \text{ s.t.} \\ [\underline{b}] = [(\underline{b}_1, \ldots, \underline{b}_m)]}} \mathsf{Kan}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{b}]}} \left[\bigotimes_{j=1}^{m} B\left(\begin{smallmatrix} c_j \\ [\underline{b}_j] \end{smallmatrix}\right) \right] \in \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{b}]}}. \tag{2.5.2}$$

The left Kan extension is defined as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{b}_j]} & \xrightarrow{\prod B\left(\begin{smallmatrix} c_j \\ - \end{smallmatrix}\right)} & \mathcal{C}^{\times m} \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathcal{C} \\ \Big\downarrow \text{concatenation} & & \Big\downarrow = \\ \Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{b}]} & \xrightarrow[\mathsf{Kan}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{b}]}}[\otimes B(:)]]{\text{left Kan extension}} & \mathcal{C}. \end{array}$$

(3) By allowing left permutations of $\underline{c}$ in (2.5.2), we obtain $B^{\otimes[\underline{c}]} \in \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]} \times \Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{\mathfrak{C}}}$ with

$$B^{\otimes[\underline{c}]}([\underline{b}]) \in \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]} \times \Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{b}]}}. \tag{2.5.3}$$

(4) The *circle product*

$$A \circ B \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$$

is defined to have components

$$(A \circ B)\left(\begin{smallmatrix} d \\ [\underline{b}] \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \coprod_{[\underline{a}] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}} A\left(\begin{smallmatrix} d \\ [\underline{a}] \end{smallmatrix}\right) \underset{\Sigma_{[\underline{a}]}}{\otimes} B^{\otimes[\underline{a}]}([\underline{b}]) \in \mathcal{C}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{b}]} \times \{d\}} \tag{2.5.4}$$

for $d \in \mathfrak{C}$ and orbits $[\underline{b}] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$, where $\underset{\Sigma_{[\underline{a}]}}{\otimes}$ is defined in (2.4.1).

The next definition is the non-symmetric version of the previous definition.

Definition 2.6. Suppose $A, B \in \mathsf{Seq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$.

(1) For $\underline{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_m), \underline{b} \in \mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C})$, define

$$B^{\otimes \underline{a}}(\underline{b}) = \coprod_{\substack{\{\underline{b}_j \in \mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C})\}_{1 \leq j \leq m} \\ \text{s.t. } \underline{b} = (\underline{b}_1, \ldots, \underline{b}_m)}} \left[\bigotimes_{j=1}^{m} B\binom{a_j}{\underline{b}_j} \right].$$

(2) The *non-symmetric circle product*

$$A \circ B \in \mathsf{Seq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$$

is defined to have entries

$$(A \circ B)\binom{d}{\underline{b}} = \coprod_{\underline{a} \in \mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C})} A\binom{d}{\underline{a}} \otimes B^{\otimes \underline{a}}(\underline{b}) \tag{2.6.1}$$

for $d \in \mathfrak{C}$ and $\underline{b} \in \mathsf{Prof}(\mathfrak{C})$.

Recall that a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored (symmetric) sequence concentrated at 0 is equivalent to a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored object. The following observation is immediate from the definition.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose Y is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored object.*

(1) For $X \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$ and with Y regarded as a symmetric sequence concentrated at 0, the circle product $X \circ Y$ is also concentrated at 0.
(2) For $X \in \mathsf{Seq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C})$ and with Y regarded as a sequence concentrated at 0, the non-symmetric circle product $X \circ Y$ is also concentrated at 0.

Proposition 2.8. *Suppose $\mathfrak{C}$ is a non-empty set of colors.*

(1) $(\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C}), \circ, \mathcal{I})$ is a monoidal category with unit $\mathcal{I}$ such that

$$\mathcal{I}\binom{d}{\underline{c}} = \begin{cases} I & \text{if } \underline{c} = d, \\ \varnothing & \text{if } \underline{c} \neq d \end{cases} \tag{2.8.1}$$

for $\underline{c} \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$ and $d \in \mathfrak{C}$.
(2) $(\mathsf{Seq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C}), \circ, \mathcal{I})$ is a monoidal category.

Proof. The first assertion is proved in [WY15]. The second assertion is proved similarly. □

Definition 2.9. Suppose $\mathfrak{C}$ is a non-empty set of colors.

(1) The category $\mathsf{Operad}^{\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}}(\mathcal{C})$ of $\mathfrak{C}$-*colored operads in* C is the category of monoids in the monoidal category $(\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C}), \circ, \mathcal{I})$.
(2) The category $\mathsf{Operad}^{\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}}(\mathcal{C})$ of $\mathfrak{C}$-*colored non-symmetric operads in* $\mathcal{C}$ is the category of monoids in the monoidal category $(\mathsf{Seq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{C}), \circ, \mathcal{I})$.
(3) A *colored (non-symmetric) operad in* $\mathcal{C}$ is a $\mathfrak{D}$-colored (non-symmetric) operad in $\mathcal{C}$ for some non-empty set of colors $\mathfrak{D}$.

(4) Suppose O is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored (non-symmetric) operad in $\mathcal{C}$. The category of algebras over the monad [Mac98] (VI.2)

$$\mathsf{O} \circ - : \mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{C}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{C}}$$

is denoted by $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}) = \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; \mathcal{C})$, whose objects are called O-*algebras*.

Proposition 2.10. *Suppose* O *is a* $\mathfrak{C}$*-colored (non-symmetric) operad in* $\mathcal{C}$*.*

(1) The category $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O})$ *has all small limits, which are created and preserved by the forgetful functor*

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathfrak{C}} \longleftarrow \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O})$$

(2) The category $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O})$ *has all small colimits, with reflexive coequalizers and filtered colimits created and preserved by the forgetful functors.*

Proof. If O is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operad, then the assertions are proved in [WY15]. The non-symmetric case is proved similarly. □

The following observation provides a way to compute $\otimes_{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}}$ (2.4.1).

Lemma 2.11. *Suppose:*

- $\underline{c} \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$ *with length* $|\underline{c}| \geq 1$*, and* $\{c^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ *are the distinct colors that appear in* $\underline{c}$ *with* c^i *appearing* $k_i \geq 1$ *times.*
- $\underline{b}$ *is in the orbit of* $\underline{c}$ *(e.g.,* $\underline{b} = \underline{c}$*).*
- $A \in \mathsf{C}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}}$*, and* $W = \{W_{c^i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq r} \in \mathsf{C}^{\{c^1, \ldots, c^r\}}$ *(i.e., each* W_{c^i} *is an object in* C*).*

Then there is a natural isomorphism

$$A \underset{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}}{\otimes} W^{\otimes [\underline{c}]} \cong A(\underline{b}) \underset{\Sigma_{k_1} \times \cdots \times \Sigma_{k_r}}{\otimes} W^{\otimes \underline{b}}. \tag{2.11.1}$$

Here:

- $- \underset{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}}{\otimes} -$ *is the colimit in* (2.4.1)*.*
- $W^{\otimes [\underline{c}]}$ *and* $W^{\otimes \underline{b}}$ *are as in* (2.5.1)*.*
- $\Sigma_{k_1} \times \cdots \times \Sigma_{k_r}$ *acts on* $A(\underline{b})$ *from the right by permuting the* k_i *copies of* c_i*'s among themselves for each* $1 \leq i \leq r$*, and likewise for* $W^{\otimes \underline{b}}$*.*

Proof. First note that a self-map of $\underline{b}$ simply permutes the k_i copies of c_i's among themselves for each $1 \leq i \leq r$. Suppose $\underline{b}'$ and $\underline{b}''$ are two objects in the orbit of $\underline{c}$. Then there is a *unique* order-preserving map $\sigma_{(\underline{b}', \underline{b}'')} : \underline{b}' \longrightarrow \underline{b}''$ in the sense that, for each $1 \leq i \leq r$, the jth copy of c^i (counting from left to right) in $\underline{b}'$ is sent to the jth

copy of c^i in $\underline{b}''$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i$. Then each map $\tau : \underline{b}' \longrightarrow \underline{b}''$ is factored as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{b}' & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{(\underline{b}',\underline{b}'')}} & \underline{b}'' \\ {\scriptstyle \tau'}\downarrow & \searrow^{\tau} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \tau''} \\ \underline{b}' & \xrightarrow[\sigma_{(\underline{b}',\underline{b}'')}]{} & \underline{b}'' \end{array}$$

for some self-maps τ' of $\underline{b}'$ and τ'' of $\underline{b}''$ that are *uniquely* determined by τ. Using these order-preserving maps $\sigma_{(\underline{b}',\underline{b}'')}$, it follows that the natural map

$$A(\underline{b}) \underset{\Sigma_{k_1}\times\cdots\times\Sigma_{k_r}}{\otimes} W^{\otimes \underline{b}} \longrightarrow A \underset{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}}{\otimes} W^{\otimes [\underline{c}]}$$

is an isomorphism. □

3. Existence of Right Bousfield Localization

Here we first recall a few definitions and existence result regarding right Bousfield localization, taken from [Hir03]. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a model category and K a set of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathrm{map}(-,-)$ denote the homotopy function complex in $\mathcal{M}$. We describe the right Bousfield localization $R_K\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ with respect to K (the chosen set of cells for $R_K\mathcal{M}$).

Definition 3.1. A map $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is a *K-colocal equivalence* if for every $A \in K$, the induced map $f_* : \mathrm{map}(A, X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{map}(A, Y)$ is a weak equivalence. These maps will become the weak equivalences in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.

Remark 3.2. If $\mathcal{M}$ is a simplicial model category then one can use the simplicial mapping space instead of the homotopy function complex. For general $\mathcal{M}$, one often needs framings. However, in this paper we have avoided the need for framings by proving in our examples of interest (all of which are *closed* symmetric monoidal categories) that one can use the internal Hom in place of map above.

Remark 3.3. If K is not a set of cofibrant objects, one can still define $R_K\mathcal{M}$, but it agrees with $R_{K'}(\mathcal{M})$ where K' is a set of cofibrant replacements for every $A \in K$. Thus, it is no loss to assume K consists of cofibrant objects from the start.

Definition 3.4. An object W is *K-colocal* if W is cofibrant and for every K-colocal equivalence $f : X \longrightarrow Y$, the induced map $f_* : \mathrm{map}(W, X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{map}(W, Y)$ is a weak equivalence.

Definition 3.5. The *right Bousfield localization* of $\mathcal{M}$ with respect to K is a model structure $R_K\mathcal{M}$ on the underlying category of $\mathcal{M}$, whose weak equivalences are the K-colocal equivalences, whose fibrations are the same as those in $\mathcal{M}$, and whose cofibrations are defined via the left lifting property.

This model structure $R_K\mathcal{M}$ need not exist in general. The following is a distillation of Theorem 5.1.1 in [Hir03] (with corrections from the errata). Recall that $\mathcal{M}$

is *right proper* if pullbacks of weak equivalences along fibrations are weak equivalences.

Theorem 3.6 (Hirschhorn)**.** *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a right proper, cellular model category and K a set of objects. Then $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists and the cofibrant objects are the K-colocal objects of $\mathcal{M}$. If every object of $\mathcal{M}$ is fibrant then $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrantly generated.*

Following [CI04], we will avoid the need to assume $\mathcal{M}$ is cellular at any point.

Definition 3.7. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category. We say that $\mathcal{M}$ is *right localizable* if it satisfies the following conditions.

(1) $\mathcal{M}$ is right proper; i.e., pullbacks along fibrations preserve weak equivalences.
(2) There exists a set J of generating trivial cofibrations [Hir03] (11.1.2(2)). This means that:
   (a) J permits the small object argument (i.e., the domains of the maps in J are J-small);
   (b) a map is a fibration precisely when it is right orthogonal to J.
(3) Every object in $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibration-small, i.e., small relative to the subclass of cofibrations.

Note that the definition of right localizable is only about the model category and is not about any set of objects in it. Next we define weaker conditions on the model category that involve a set of cofibrant objects. The essence of the next definition is that, in order to construct the right Bousfield localization, one needs a functorial factorization of each map into a K-colocal cofibration followed by a K-colocal trivial fibration. Not surprisingly, this comes down to Quillen's small object argument. The following definitions provide two different ways to use the small object argument to obtain the desired factorization, as discussed in [Hir03] (5.2.3) and [CI04] (2.5).

Definition 3.8. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a right proper model category, and K is a set of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$.

(1) We say that the pair $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is *type 1 right localizable* if it satisfies the following conditions.
   (a) There exists a set J of generating trivial cofibrations.
   (b) Define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(K) &= \left\{ \mathbf{A} \otimes \partial\Delta[n] \longrightarrow \mathbf{A} \otimes \Delta[n] \mid A \in K,\, n \geq 0 \right\}, \\ \overline{\Lambda(K)} &= \Lambda(K) \cup \mathsf{J}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8.1}$$

   where $\mathbf{A}$ is a cosimplicial resolution of $A \in K$ [Hir03] (16.1.2(1)). Then $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ permits the small object argument, i.e., the domains of the maps in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ are $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$-small.

(2) We say that the pair $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is *type 2 right localizable* if it satisfies the following conditions.
   (a) There exists a regular cardinal κ such that each object of K is κ-small relative to cofibrations.
   (b) Suppose given a diagram



   in $\mathcal{M}$ in which the top row is a κ-sequence (with κ as in the previous condition) of cofibrations, and the map $X_\beta \longrightarrow Y$ is a fibration for each successor ordinal β. Then the map $\operatorname{colim}_\beta X_\beta \longrightarrow Y$ is also a fibration.

(3) We say that the pair $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is *right localizable* if it is either type 1 right localizable or type 2 right localizable.

The definition of type 1 right localizable is extracted from [Hir03] (Chapter 5), while the definition of type 2 right localizable is precisely [CI04] (2.4)

Proposition 3.9. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category, and K is a set of cofibrant objects. If $\mathcal{M}$ is right localizable, then $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is both type 1 right localizable and type 2 right localizable. In particular, $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable.*

Proof. By assumption $\mathcal{M}$ is right proper and has a set J of generating trivial cofibrations, and every object in $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibration-small. That $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ is $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$-small follows from the fact that every map in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ is a cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$ (see the proof of [Hir03] 5.2.5) and the fact that K-colocal cofibrations are, in particular, cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}$. So the pair $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is type 1 right localizable.

To see that $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is type 2 right localizable, as mentioned in [CI04] (under 2.4), just choose κ such that the domains in J and the objects in K are κ-small relative to cofibrations. □

The following general existence result of right Bousfield localization is proved in [Hir03] (Chapter 5, in particular 5.1.1 and 5.1.2) and, with a variation of the argument, in [CI04] (Section 2).

Theorem 3.10. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category, and K is a set of cofibrant objects such that $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable. Then the following statements hold.*

(1) The right Bousfield localization $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists [Hir03] *(3.3.1).*
(2) The cofibrant objects in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ are precisely the K-colocal objects in $\mathcal{M}$.
(3) $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is right proper.
(4) If every object in $\mathcal{M}$ is fibrant and if $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrantly generated by (I, J), then $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrantly generated by $\left(\overline{\Lambda(K)}, \mathsf{J}\right)$.

(5) *If $\mathcal{M}$ is a simplicial model category, then $R_K\mathcal{M}$ inherits a simplicial model category structure.*

Graphically, the above conditions are related as follows:



However, to ensure that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrantly generated, one needs to assume a little bit more.

4. Monoidality in Right Bousfield Localization

In this section, we address the question of when $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is a *monoidal* model category, i.e., satisfies the pushout product axiom.

Definition 4.1. A right Bousfield localization R_K is said to be a *monoidal right Bousfield localization* if $R_K\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the pushout product axiom. The *smallest monoidal right Bousfield localization* for a given $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is a monoidal model structure $R_K\mathcal{M}^{\otimes}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ such that the identity id: $\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow R_K\mathcal{M}^{\otimes}$ is the initial monoidal right Quillen functor to a monoidal model category taking K-colocal equivalences to weak equivalences

This universal property is the monoidal analogue of [Hir03] (3.3.18) and the dual of [Whi14b] (4.8).

Definition 4.2. Suppose:

- $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category with a set J of generating trivial cofibrations.
- K is a set of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$.

Define the following condition.

> \$: If A is a domain or a codomain of a map in $\overline{\Lambda(K)} = \Lambda(K) \cup \mathsf{J}$ (3.8.1), then the functor
>
> $$\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}(A,-)} \mathcal{M}$$
>
> takes K-colocal equivalences between fibrant objects to K-colocal equivalences.

We will say that $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ *satisfies \$* if this condition holds.

Recall once again that $\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$, if it exists, have the same fibrations and also the same trivial cofibrations. In particular, in \$ and everywhere else it is not necessary to specify whether an object is fibrant in $\mathcal{M}$ or fibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibrantly generated monoidal model category in which every object is fibrant.*
- *K is a set of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable.*
- *All the domains and codomains of the maps in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ are K-colocal objects.*

Then $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is a right proper, cofibrantly generated, monoidal model category if and only if \$ holds.

Remark 4.4. This theorem demonstrates that the smallest monoidal Bousfield localization for a given right-localizable $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ has colocal objects generated by $K' = K \cup D$, where D is the set of domains and codomains of maps in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$, and has weak equivalences the closure of the K-colocal equivalences under $\mathrm{Hom}(A, -)$ for $A \in K'$. Remark 9.4 demonstrates this for the example of topological spaces. As remarked in [Gut12], the existence of this model structure can be verified by carrying through the exposition in [Hir03] or in [Bar10] using Hom instead of map, and Theorem 2.12 in [GR14] provides an alternative construction in case $\mathcal{M}$ is combinatorial.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. First note that by Theorem 3.10, $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists and is a right proper, cofibrantly generated model category with generating cofibrations $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$. So we must show that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the pushout product axiom if and only if \$ holds.

For the *if* direction, suppose that \$ holds, $j : A \longrightarrow B$ is a cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, and $p : X \longrightarrow Y$ is a fibration. We write Hom for the internal hom in $\mathcal{M}$. We must show that the pullback corner map (j, p) in

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}(B,X) & & \\ & \searrow^{(j,p)} & \\ & & PB \xrightarrow{p^{\#}} \mathrm{Hom}(B,Y) \\ & & \downarrow \qquad\qquad \downarrow \\ & & \mathrm{Hom}(A,X) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}(A,p)} \mathrm{Hom}(A,Y) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{l} \mathrm{Hom}(B,p) \\ \text{curves over} \\ \text{the diagram} \end{array} \tag{4.4.1}$$

is a fibration that is also a K-colocal equivalence if either j or p is such. Here

$$PB = \mathrm{Hom}(A, X) \underset{\mathrm{Hom}(A,Y)}{\times} \mathrm{Hom}(B, Y)$$

is the pullback.

(1) Observe that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ has fewer cofibrations than $\mathcal{M}$, so j is also a cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$. So (j, p) is a fibration by the pushout product axiom on $\mathcal{M}$.
(2) We turn next to the case where j is a trivial cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, hence also in $\mathcal{M}$ because $\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have the same trivial cofibrations. By the pushout product axiom on $\mathcal{M}$, (j, p) is a trivial fibration in $\mathcal{M}$, hence also in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.
(3) Lastly, suppose p is a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. We already know that (j, p) is a fibration by our first case above. So by [Hov99] (4.2.5) it is sufficient to check that (j, p) is a K-colocal equivalence for $j \in \overline{\Lambda(K)}$, the set of generating cofibrations of $R_K\mathcal{M}$. By the 2-out-of-3 property of K-colocal equivalences [Hir03] (3.2.3(2)) it is enough to check that both $p^\#$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(B, p)$ in (4.4.1) are K-colocal equivalences.

Since A is the domain of $j \in \overline{\Lambda(K)}$, it is by assumption a K-colocal object, in particular a cofibrant object in $\mathcal{M}$. Recall that $\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have the same fibrations, and a trivial fibration in $\mathcal{M}$ is also a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. So the pushout product axiom on $\mathcal{M}$ implies that

$$R_K\mathcal{M} \underset{\mathrm{Hom}(A,-)}{\overset{-\otimes A}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{M} \tag{4.4.2}$$

is a Quillen pair because the right adjoint $\mathrm{Hom}(A, -)$ preserves fibrations and trivial fibrations.

Next note that, by the 2-out-of-3 property of K-colocal equivalences, a fibrant approximation in $\mathcal{M}$ to a K-colocal equivalence is a K-colocal equivalence between fibrant objects. The assumption \$ says that $\mathrm{Hom}(A, -)$ in (4.4.2) takes K-colocal equivalences between fibrant objects to K-colocal equivalences. So 3.3.18(2) in [Hir03] now says that

$$R_K\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}(A,-)} R_K\mathcal{M}$$

is a right Quillen functor. Thus, the bottom horizontal map $\mathrm{Hom}(A, p)$ in (4.4.1) is a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ because p is a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. It follows that its pullback $p^\#$ is also a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, hence a K-colocal equivalence.

Likewise, since B is the codomain of $j \in \overline{\Lambda(K)}$, the map $\mathrm{Hom}(B, p)$ in (4.4.1) is a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, hence a K-colocal equivalence, because

$$R_K\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}(B,-)} R_K\mathcal{M}$$

is a right Quillen functor and p is a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. Thus, by the 2-out-of-3 property in the top triangle, the pullback corner map (j, p) is a K-colocal equivalence as required.

We have shown that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the pushout product axiom.

Next, for the *only if* direction, suppose $R_K\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the pushout product axiom. To prove \$, suppose A is the domain or the codomain of a map in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$.

Then A is cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ by assumption. The pushout product axiom on $R_K\mathcal{M}$ implies that

$$R_K\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}(A,-)} R_K\mathcal{M}$$

preserves trivial fibrations in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. By Ken Brown's Lemma ([Hov99] 1.1.12), this functor takes all weak equivalences in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ between fibrant objects to weak equivalences in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. This is the condition \$. □

The last assumption in Theorem 4.3 says that all the domains and codomains of the maps in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ are K-colocal objects. We next address the question of when this condition holds.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibrantly generated, monoidal, simplicial model category in which every object is fibrant.*
- *K is a set of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable.*

Then the following statements are equivalent.

(1) All the generating trivial cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}$ have K-colocal domains.
(2) All the domains and codomains of the maps in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ are K-colocal objects.
(3) The generating cofibrations and generating trivial cofibrations in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have K-colocal domains .

Proof. By Theorem 3.10, the right Bousfield localization $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is a right proper, simplicial model category and is cofibrantly generated by $(\overline{\Lambda(K)}, \mathsf{J})$, where J is the set of generating trivial cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}$. We will prove (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2).

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3). If (2) is true, then all the maps in $\mathsf{J} \subseteq \overline{\Lambda(K)}$ also have K-colocal domains.

(3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1). If (3) is true, then all the maps in J (= generating trivial cofibrations in $R_K\mathcal{M}$) have K-colocal domains.

(1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2). Suppose (1) is true, so all the maps in J have K-colocal domains. To prove (2), since every map in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ is a cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, it is enough to show that the domain of each map in $\overline{\Lambda(K)}$ is K-colocal. Moreover, since $\overline{\Lambda(K)} = \Lambda(K) \cup \mathsf{J}$, it remains to show that maps in $\Lambda(K)$ have K-colocal domains. In other words, we must show that each $\mathbf{A} \otimes \partial\Delta[n]$ is a K-colocal object for $A \in K$.

For each $A \in K$, recall that $\mathbf{A}$ is a cosimplicial resolution of A in $\mathcal{M}^\Delta$. Using the simplicial structure on $\mathcal{M}$, we now choose its cosimplicial resolution as follows:

$$\mathbf{A} = \Big\{\mathbf{A}^n = A \otimes \Delta[n] : n \geq 0\Big\}.$$

This $\mathbf{A}$ is indeed a cosimplicial resolution of A in $\mathcal{M}^\Delta$ by [Hir03] (16.1.4(1)) because A is cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}$ by assumption. But note that A is also K-colocal (= cofibrant

in $R_K\mathcal{M}$) and that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ inherits its simplicial model structure from $\mathcal{M}$. So by [Hir03] (16.1.4(1)) applied to $R_K\mathcal{M}$, the same $\mathbf{A}$ is also a cosimplicial resolution of A in $(R_K\mathcal{M})^\Delta$. In particular, $\mathbf{A} \in (R_K\mathcal{M})^\Delta$ is Reedy cofibrant. So [Hir03] (16.3.9(1)) applied to $R_K\mathcal{M}$ says that $\mathbf{A} \otimes \partial\Delta[n]$ is a cofibrant object in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, hence K-colocal as desired. □

Corollary 4.6. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibrantly generated, monoidal, simplicial model category in which every object is fibrant.*
- *K is a set of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable.*
- *All the generating trivial cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}$ have K-colocal domains.*

Then $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is a right proper, cofibrantly generated, monoidal, simplicial model category if and only if \$ holds.

Proof. This follows from Theorems 3.10, 4.3, and 4.5. □

5. Model Structure on Algebras in Right Bousfield Localization

In this section we provide sufficient conditions under which all colored operads in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ are admissible.

The following definitions and examples are from [BM03, BM07].

Definition 5.1. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category that is also a symmetric monoidal closed category with $\otimes$-unit I.

(1) A *coalgebra interval* consists of a counital comonoid object H in $\mathcal{M}$ together with a factorization

$$I \amalg I \xrightarrow{(i_0, i_1)} H \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} I \tag{5.1.1}$$

of the fold map of I, in which:
- both maps (i_0, i_1) and ε are maps of comonoids;
- (i_0, i_1) is a cofibration;
- ε is a weak equivalence.

(2) A *cocommutative coalgebra interval* is a coalgebra interval H whose comonoid structure is cocommutative.

Example 5.2. In the context of the previous definition:

(1) Familiar examples of monoidal model categories admitting a cocommutative coalgebra interval include the categories of compactly generated Hausdorff spaces, of simplicial sets, and of symmetric spectra.
(2) The category of unbounded chain complexes over a commutative ring with unit admits a coalgebra interval that is *not* cocommutative..

Definition 5.3. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category, and T is a monad on $\mathcal{M}$.

(1) A *fibrant T-algebra* in $\mathcal{M}$ is a T-algebra whose underlying object is fibrant in $\mathcal{M}$.
(2) For $X \in \mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$, a *path object* in $\mathcal{M}$ is a factorization

$$X \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathsf{Path}(X) \twoheadrightarrow X \times X \tag{5.3.1}$$

in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$ of the diagonal map in which the first map is a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{M}$ and the second map is a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$.

Taking internal hom out of a coalgebra interval leads to functorial path objects as follows; see [BM03] (proof of 3.1) and [BM07] (proof of 2.1).

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a monoidal model category with a cofibrant $\otimes$-unit and a coalgebra interval.*

(1) If O is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored non-symmetric operad in $\mathcal{M}$, then fibrant O-algebras in $\mathcal{M}$ have functorial path objects in $\mathcal{M}$.
(2) If the coalgebra interval is furthermore cocommutative and if O is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operad in $\mathcal{M}$, then fibrant O-algebras in $\mathcal{M}$ have functorial path objects in $\mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is a monoidal model category with a cofibrant $\otimes$-unit and a coalgebra interval.*
- *K is a class of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists.*

Then the following statements hold.

(1) If O is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored non-symmetric operad in $\mathcal{M}$, then fibrant O-algebras in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have functorial path objects in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.
(2) If the coalgebra interval is furthermore cocommutative and if O is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operad in $\mathcal{M}$, then fibrant O-algebras in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have functorial path objects in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Suppose O is either a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored non-symmetric operad or a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operad in $\mathcal{M}$, and X is a fibrant O-algebra in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. This means that X is an O-algebra with each colored entry fibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, i.e., fibrant in $\mathcal{M}$. So X is also a fibrant O-algebra in $\mathcal{M}$. By Lemma 5.4 it has a path object (5.3.1) in $\mathcal{M}$ that is functorial in X. In this path object, the first map is a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{M}$, hence also a weak equivalence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ [Hir03] (3.3.3(2)(a)). The second map is a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$, hence also a fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ by definition. So this is actually a path object in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. □

Remark 5.6. We are *not* asserting that the $\otimes$-unit is cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ or that a coalgebra interval in $\mathcal{M}$ is also one in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. The reason is that not every cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. Luckily, what we truly need is a functorial path object for fibrant algebras, and fibrations in $\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$ are the same.

The following general transfer result is a slight modification of [BM07] (2.1). It is a colored variant of [BM03] (3.2 and remark afterwards), which in turn is essentially a consequence of [SS00] (2.3(2)). The proof is basically the same as in [BM07], where

it is assumed that there be a (cocommutative) coalgebra interval. Here we assume directly that fibrant algebras have functorial path objects.

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose:*

- $\mathcal{M}$ *is a cofibrantly generated monoidal model category with a symmetric monoidal fibrant replacement functor.*
- O *is either a* $\mathfrak{C}$*-colored operad in* $\mathcal{M}$ *or a* $\mathfrak{C}$*-colored non-symmetric operad in* $\mathcal{M}$*.*
- *fibrant* O*-algebras have functorial path objects.*
- *the domains of maps in* $\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{I}$ *(resp.* $\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{J}$*) are small with respect to relative* $(\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{I})$*-cell complexes (resp. relative* $(\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{J})$*-cell complexes).*

Then the following statements hold.

(1) $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};\mathcal{M})$ *admits a cofibrantly generated model structure with weak equivalences and fibrations defined entrywise in* $\mathcal{M}$*.*
(2) The sets of generating cofibrations and of generating trivial cofibrations in $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};\mathcal{M})$ *are* $\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{I}$ *and* $\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{J}$*, respectively, where* (I,J) *are the sets of generating (trivial) cofibrations in* $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ *(see* [Hir03] *11.1.10).*
(3) The free-forgetful adjunction

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}} \underset{U}{\overset{\mathsf{O}\circ -}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};\mathcal{M}) \tag{5.7.1}$$

is a Quillen adjunction.

We now apply Theorem 5.7 to right Bousfield localization $R_K\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 5.8. *Suppose* $\mathcal{M}$ *is a cofibrantly generated, monoidal, simplicial model category in which every object is fibrant. Furthermore, suppose:*

- *It has a cofibrant* $\otimes$*-unit and a coalgebra interval* H*.*
- K *is a set of cofibrant objects in* $\mathcal{M}$ *such that* $(\mathcal{M},K)$ *is right localizable.*
- *All the generating trivial cofibrations in* $\mathcal{M}$ *have* K*-colocal domains.*
- *It satisfies the condition $ in Definition 4.2.*

Then the following statements hold.

(1) If O *is a* $\mathfrak{C}$*-colored non-symmetric operad in* $\mathcal{M}$ *such that the domains of maps in* $\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{I}_K$ *(resp.* $\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{J}$*) are small with respect to relative* $(\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{I}_K)$*-cell complexes (resp. relateive* $(\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{J})$*-cell complexes), then* $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};R_K\mathcal{M})$ *admits a cofibrantly generated model structure such that:*
  (a) Weak equivalences and fibrations in $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};R_K\mathcal{M})$ *are defined entrywise in* $R_K\mathcal{M}$*.*
  (b) The sets of generating cofibrations and of generating trivial cofibrations in $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};R_K\mathcal{M})$ *are* $\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{I}_K$ *and* $\mathsf{O}\circ\mathsf{J}_K$*, respectively, where* $(\mathsf{I}_K,\mathsf{J}_K)$ *are the sets of generating (trivial) cofibrations in* $(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\mathfrak{C}}$*.*

(c) *The free-forgetful adjunction*

$$(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\mathfrak{C}} \underset{U}{\overset{\mathsf{O}\circ -}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; R_K\mathcal{M}) \tag{5.8.1}$$

is a Quillen adjunction.

(2) *Suppose the coalgebra interval H is cocommutative. Then the conclusions of the previous case hold for every $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operad in $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. By Corollary 4.6 $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is a right proper, cofibrantly generated, monoidal, simplicial model category in which every object is fibrant (because every object in $\mathcal{M}$ is fibrant). By Proposition 5.5 fibrant O-algebras in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have functorial path objects in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. Therefore, Theorem 5.7 applies to $R_K\mathcal{M}$ to yield the desired conclusions. □

Remark 5.9. By Lemma 5.4 the hypotheses of Theorem 5.8 subsume those of Theorem 5.7. So when Theorem 5.8 is applicable, then so is Theorem 5.7.

Denote by Top either the category of compactly generated spaces or the category of compactly generated weak Hausdorff spaces. For a finite group G, denote by Top^G the respective category of G-equivariant spaces and maps.

Proposition 5.10. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is a combinatorial model category or if $\mathcal{M}$ is either Top or Top^G for a finite group G, then the smallness hypotheses in Theorems 5.7 and 5.8 are satisfied.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{M}$ is combinatorial then all objects are small relative to the whole category, and the same remains true in $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; R_K\mathcal{M})$.

For the category of (G-equivariant) topological spaces, Lemma 2.4.1 in [Hov99] implies all spaces are small relative to the class of topological inclusions. Since Top is $\mathsf{Top}^{\{e\}}$ with $\{e\}$ the trivial group, it is enough to consider the case Top^G for a general finite group G. We use $\otimes$ to denote the monoidal product in Top^G. In the category of compactly generated spaces (resp. compactly generated weak Hausdorff spaces), inclusions (resp. closed inclusions) are saturated with respect to transfinite composition, pushout, smash product, Cartesian product, and passage to coinvariants under a groupoid action, as can readily be checked (see [Whi13] for an exposition).

It is therefore sufficient to argue that $\mathsf{O} \circ \mathsf{I}, \mathsf{O} \circ \mathsf{J}$, and $\mathsf{O} \circ \mathsf{I}_K$ are contained in the class of inclusions (resp. closed inclusions). By the definition of the circle product (2.5.4) and Lemma 2.11 (in the symmetric case), by the definition of the nonsymmetric circle product (2.6.1), and by the saturation properties of (closed) inclusions stated in the previous paragraph, it suffices to show that every map in I, J, and I_K is a (closed) inclusion. This is certainly true for I and J. Using Lemma 9.2, we take I_K to be the set of maps of the form $K \otimes i_n$ where $i_n \in \mathsf{I}$. It follows that every map in I_K is a (closed) inclusion. □

6. Preservation of Algebras Under Right Bousfield Localization

In this section we will discuss preservation of monadic algebras under right Bousfield localization.

Definition 6.1. Assume that:

- $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category, and T is a monad on $\mathcal{M}$.
- K is a class of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$ such that the right Bousfield localization $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists.

Then R_K is said to *preserve T-algebras* if:

(1) When E is a T-algebra there is some T-algebra $\widetilde{E}$ that is weakly equivalent in $\mathcal{M}$ to $R_K E$.
(2) In addition, when E is a T-algebra that is fibrant in $\mathcal{M}$, there is a choice of $\widetilde{E}$ and a lift of the localization map $R_K E \longrightarrow E$ to a T-algebra homomorphism $\widetilde{E} \longrightarrow E$.

If $T = F_{\mathsf{O}}$ is the free O-algebra monad of a colored operad O, then we say that R_K *preserves O-algebras* if it preserves F_{O}-algebras.

The following general preservation result is the right Bousfield localization analogue of Theorem 7.2.3 in [WY15], which deals with left Bousfield localization. Although we are mostly interested in colored operads, the following preservation result holds for general monads. Furthermore, it only requires semi-model structures on T-algebras.

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose:*

(1) $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category, and T is a monad on $\mathcal{M}$.
(2) K is a class of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$ such that the right Bousfield localization $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists.
(3) $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$ inherits a projective semi-model structure from $\mathcal{M}$ with weak equivalences and fibrations created in $\mathcal{M}$.
(4) $\mathsf{Alg}(T;R_K\mathcal{M})$ inherits a projective semi-model structure from $R_K\mathcal{M}$ with weak equivalences and fibrations created in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.
(5) The forgetful functor

$$\mathsf{Alg}(T;R_K\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow R_K\mathcal{M} \tag{6.2.1}$$

preserves cofibrant objects.

Then R_K preserves T-algebras.

Proof. Let Q_K denote cofibrant replacement in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, let $Q_{K,T}$ denote cofibrant replacement in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;R_K\mathcal{M})$, and let Q_T and B_T denote cofibrant replacement and fibrant replacement in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$. Since $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$ is a *semi*-model category, we will only apply B_T to cofibrant objects in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$. We first focus on the first form

of preservation and at the end turn our attention to the case where E is a fibrant T-algebra.

Pick a T-algebra E. Let us first make a remark. If E is not cofibrant in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$, we first take its cofibrant replacement $Q_T E$ in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$. Since $Q_T E \longrightarrow E$ is a trivial fibration in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$, it is also a trivial fibration in $\mathcal{M}$. Applying the functorial fibrant replacement B in $\mathcal{M}$ then yields a weak equivalence $BQ_T E \longrightarrow BE$ in $\mathcal{M}$. So applying cofibrant replacement in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ yields a weak equivalence

$$Q_K BQ_T E \longrightarrow Q_K BE$$

in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ between K-colocal objects. Thus, [Hir03] (3.2.13(2)) implies that it is actually a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{M}$.

Because Q_K is the left derived functor of the identity adjunction between $\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$, and B is the right derived functor of the identity, we know that $B_K E$ is weakly equivalent to $Q_K BE$ in $\mathcal{M}$. Combined with the previous paragraph, we infer that $B_K E$ is weakly equivalent to $Q_K BQ_T E$ in $\mathcal{M}$. Our model of $\widetilde{E}$ will be $Q_{K,T}B_T Q_T E$. We must therefore show

$$Q_K BQ_T E \simeq Q_{K,T}B_T Q_T E$$

in $\mathcal{M}$.

The fibrant replacement $Q_T E \longrightarrow BQ_T E$ is a trivial cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$. The fibrant replacement $Q_T E \longrightarrow B_T Q_T E$–which exists because $Q_T E$ is cofibrant in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$–is a weak equivalence in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$, hence in $\mathcal{M}$. The map $B_T Q_T E \longrightarrow *$ is a fibration in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;\mathcal{M})$, hence in $\mathcal{M}$. Consider the following lifting diagram in $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q_T E & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & B_T Q_T E \\ {\scriptstyle\simeq}\downarrow & \overset{\alpha}{\nearrow} & \downarrow\!\!\downarrow \\ BQ_T E & \longrightarrow & * \end{array} \tag{6.2.2}$$

The lifting axiom gives the dotted lift $\alpha : BQ_T E \longrightarrow B_T Q_T E$, and it is necessarily a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{M}$ by the 2-out-of-3 property.

Since $B_T Q_T E$ is a T-algebra in $\mathcal{M}$ it must also be a T-algebra in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. In the following diagram, the left vertical is a cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, the right vertical is a trivial fibration in $\mathsf{Alg}(T;R_K\mathcal{M})$, hence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, and the bottom horizontal map is a weak equivalence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. We may therefore construct a dotted lift β:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \varnothing & \longrightarrow & Q_{K,T}B_T Q_T E \\ \downarrow & \overset{\beta}{\nearrow} & \downarrow\!\!\downarrow{\scriptstyle\simeq} \\ Q_K B_T Q_T E & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & B_T Q_T E \end{array}$$

By the 2-out-of-3 property, the lift β is a weak equivalence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. We make use of this map as the horizontal map in the lower right corner of the diagram below.

The top horizontal map $\alpha : BQ_TE \longrightarrow B_TQ_TE$ in the following diagram is the first map we constructed, which was proven to be a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{M}$. The square in the diagram below is then obtained by applying Q_K to that map. In particular, the map

$$Q_KBQ_TE \longrightarrow Q_KB_TQ_TE$$

is a weak equivalence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} BQ_TE & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & B_TQ_TE & & \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ Q_KBQ_TE & \xrightarrow{Q_K\alpha} & Q_KB_TQ_TE & \xrightarrow{\beta} & Q_{K,T}B_TQ_TE \end{array}$$

We have shown that both of the bottom horizontal maps are weak equivalences in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. Thus, by the 2-out-of-3 property, their composite

$$Q_KBQ_TE \longrightarrow Q_{K,T}B_TQ_TE$$

is a weak equivalence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. All the objects in the bottom row are cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. Note that $Q_{K,T}B_TQ_TE$ is cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ by the assumption that the forgetful functor $\mathsf{Alg}(T; R_K\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow R_K\mathcal{M}$ preserves cofibrant objects. So the above K-colocal equivalences are actually weak equivalences in $\mathcal{M}$ by Theorem 3.2.13(2) in [Hir03].

As E was a T-algebra and B_TQ_T and $Q_{K,T}$ are endofunctors on categories of T-algebras, it is clear that $Q_{K,T}B_TQ_TE$ is a T-algebra. We have just shown that B_KE is weakly equivalent in $\mathcal{M}$ to this T-algebra, so we are done.

We turn now to the case where E is assumed to be a fibrant T-algebra (so E is fibrant in $\mathcal{M}$ as well). We have seen that there is an $\mathcal{M}$-weak equivalence

$$Q_KBQ_TE \longrightarrow Q_{K,T}B_TQ_TE,$$

and above we took $Q_{K,T}B_TQ_TE$ in $\mathcal{M}$ as our representative for B_KE in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathcal{M})$. Because E is a fibrant T-algebra, so is its cofibrant replacement Q_TE in $\mathsf{Alg}(T; \mathcal{M})$. There are weak equivalences

$$Q_TE \rightleftarrows B_TQ_TE$$

in $\mathsf{Alg}(T; R_K\mathcal{M})$ because all fibrant replacements of a given object are weakly equivalent, e.g., by diagram (6.2.2). So passage to B_TQ_TE is unnecessary when E is a fibrant T-algebra, and we take $Q_{K,T}Q_TE$ as our representative for B_KE. We may then lift the localization map $R_KE \longrightarrow E$ in $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathcal{M})$ to the composite

$$Q_{K,T}Q_TE \longrightarrow Q_TE \longrightarrow E$$

in $\mathcal{M}$. As both Q_T and $Q_{K,T}$ are taken in $\mathsf{Alg}(T)$, this composite map is a T-algebra homomorphism, as desired. □

Remark 6.3. Theorems 10.4 and 10.10 in [CRT14] give an alternative approach to preservation of algebraic structure under colocalization, by seeking to lift colocalization functors to the level of T-algebras. For left Bousfield localizations, Batanin

and the first author have proven that the preservation in [Whi14b] (dual to our theorem above) is equivalent to the preservation in [CRT14] via lifting, in situations where both apply. We do not know if the same is true for right Bousfield localization.

7. Entrywise Colocal Colored Operads

The main observation in this section is Theorem 7.6. It provides sufficient conditions under which R_K preserves O-algebras for an entrywise K-colocal colored operad.

Throughout this section, assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category and that K is a class of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$. First recall the following condition $\clubsuit$ from [WY15] (Definition 6.2.1).

Definition 7.1. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a symmetric monoidal category and is a model category. Define the following condition.

> $\clubsuit$: For each $n \geq 1$ and $X \in \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_n^{\mathrm{op}}}$ that is cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}$, the function
> $$X \underset{\Sigma_n}{\otimes} (-)^{\square n} : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$$
> preserves cofibrations and trivial cofibrations.

The condition $\clubsuit$ for cofibrations will be referred to as $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{cof}}$, and the condition for trivial cofibrations as $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{t.cof}}$. So
$$\clubsuit = \clubsuit_{\mathrm{cof}} + \clubsuit_{\mathrm{t.cof}}.$$
Write $\clubsuit^{\mathcal{M}}$, $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{cof}}^{\mathcal{M}}$, and $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{t.cof}}^{\mathcal{M}}$ if it is necessary to specify the category $\mathcal{M}$.

To put a suitable model structure on the category of algebras over a colored operad in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, we will employ Theorem 6.2.3 in [WY15] to $R_K\mathcal{M}$, for which we need $\clubsuit^{R_K\mathcal{M}}$. In other words, we need $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{cof}}^{R_K\mathcal{M}}$ and $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{t.cof}}^{R_K\mathcal{M}}$. The following lemma deals with $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{t.cof}}^{R_K\mathcal{M}}$.

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists. Then $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{t.cof}}^{\mathcal{M}}$ implies $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{t.cof}}^{R_K\mathcal{M}}$.*

Proof. Suppose $X \in (R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma_n^{\mathrm{op}}} = \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_n^{\mathrm{op}}}$ is cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. So X is also cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}$. The condition $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{t.cof}}^{\mathcal{M}}$ says that the map
$$\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} (-)^{\square n}} \mathcal{M}$$
preserves trivial cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}$. But $\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have the same fibrations, hence the same trivial cofibrations. □

The following condition will be used to obtain $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{cof}}^{R_K\mathcal{M}}$.

Definition 7.3. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a symmetric monoidal category and is a model category, and K is a set of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$. Define the following condition.

♦ : For each $n \geq 1$, $X \in \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_n^{\mathrm{op}}}$ that is a K-colocal object in $\mathcal{M}$, and map $\beta : U \longrightarrow V \in \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_n^{\mathrm{op}}}$ that is both a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$ and a K-colocal equivalence, every solid-arrow diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & U \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \beta \\ X & \longrightarrow & V \end{array}$$

in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_n^{\mathrm{op}}}$ admits a dotted lift.

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is a monoidal model category. Then ♦ implies $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{cof}}^{R_K\mathcal{M}}$.*

Proof. Suppose $X \in (R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma_n^{\mathrm{op}}}$ is cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ (i.e., a K-colocal object in $\mathcal{M}$), $f : A \longrightarrow B$ is a cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, and $p : Y \longrightarrow Z$ is a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. The condition $\clubsuit_{\mathrm{cof}}^{R_K\mathcal{M}}$ says that every commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \underset{\Sigma_n}{\otimes} A^{\square n} & \longrightarrow & Y \\ {\scriptstyle X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} f^{\square n}} \downarrow & \overset{\alpha}{\nearrow} & \downarrow {\scriptstyle p} \\ X \underset{\Sigma_n}{\otimes} B^{\square n} & \longrightarrow & Z \end{array}$$

in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ admits a dotted arrow that makes the entire diagram commutative. A dotted filler α exists if and only if a dotted filler α' exists in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathrm{Hom}(B^{\square n}, Y) \\ & \overset{\alpha'}{\nearrow} & \downarrow {\scriptstyle (f^{\square n}, p)} \\ X & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(A^{\square n}, Y) \underset{\mathrm{Hom}(A^{\square n}, Z)}{\times} \mathrm{Hom}(B^{\square n}, Z) \end{array}$$

in $(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma_n^{\mathrm{op}}}$. Assuming the condition ♦, to show that the dotted filler α' exists, we just need to see that the pullback corner map $(f^{\square n}, p)$ satisfies the condition for β in ♦. In other words, we need to show that the map $(f^{\square n}, p)$ is both a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$ and a K-colocal equivalence.

Since f is a cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, the iterated pushout product $f^{\square n}$ is also a cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ by the pushout product axiom in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. The map p is a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ by assumption. So the pushout product axiom in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ once again implies that the map $(f^{\square n}, p)$ is a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. Since the fibrations in $\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$ are the same, the map $(f^{\square n}, p)$ is a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$. Finally, the map $(f^{\square n}, p)$ is a weak equivalence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, i.e., a K-colocal equivalence. □

Theorem 7.5. *Suppose:*

- *$R_K\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibrantly generated monoidal model category.*

- $\clubsuit^{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{t.cof}}$ *and* $\blacklozenge$ *are satisfied.*
- O *is a* $\mathfrak{C}$*-colored operad in* $\mathcal{M}$ *that is entrywise a* K*-colocal object in* $\mathcal{M}$*.*

Then:

(1) *The category* $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; R_K\mathcal{M})$ *admits a cofibrantly generated* semi*-model structure over* $R_K\mathcal{M}$ *such that the weak equivalences and fibrations are created in* $R_K\mathcal{M}$*.*
(2) *If* $j : A \longrightarrow B \in \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; R_K\mathcal{M})$ *is a cofibration with* A *cofibrant in* $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; R_K\mathcal{M})$*, then the underlying map of* j *is entrywise a cofibration in* $R_K\mathcal{M}$*.*
(3) *Every* O*-algebra that is cofibrant in* $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; R_K\mathcal{M})$ *is entrywise cofibrant in* $R_K\mathcal{M}$*.*

Proof. The operad O is entrywise cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ by assumption. By Lemmas 7.2 and 7.4 the conditions $\clubsuit^{\mathcal{M}}_{\text{t.cof}}$ and $\blacklozenge$ together imply $\clubsuit^{R_K\mathcal{M}} = \clubsuit^{R_K\mathcal{M}}_{\text{cof}} + \clubsuit^{R_K\mathcal{M}}_{\text{t.cof}}$. So Theorem 6.2.3 in [WY15] can be applied to $R_K\mathcal{M}$, and the conclusions are the three statements above. □

Theorem 7.6. *Suppose:*

- $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $R_K\mathcal{M}$ *are cofibrantly generated monoidal model categories.*
- $\clubsuit^{\mathcal{M}}$ *and* $\blacklozenge$ *are satisfied.*
- O *is a* $\mathfrak{C}$*-colored operad in* $\mathcal{M}$ *that is entrywise a* K*-colocal object in* $\mathcal{M}$*.*

Then R_K *preserves* O*-algebras.*

Proof. We will use Theorem 6.2 with $T = F_{\mathsf{O}}$ the monad on $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ associated to the colored operad O [WY15] (Definition 4.1.1). So we now check the hypotheses in Theorem 6.2.

(1) $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists by assumption.
(2) Note that O is also entrywise cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}$, since every cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is also a cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$ and O is entrywise cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ by assumption. So $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; \mathcal{M})$ inherits a semi-model structure from $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ by Theorem 6.2.3 in [WY15] and the assumption that $\clubsuit^{\mathcal{M}}$ is satisfied. Likewise, $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; R_K\mathcal{M})$ inherits a semi-model structure from $(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\mathfrak{C}}$ by Theorem 7.5(1).
(3) The forgetful functor
$$\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}; R_K\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow (R_K\mathcal{M})^{\mathfrak{C}}$$
preserves cofibrant objects by Theorem 7.5(3).

□

8. Σ-Cofibrant Colored Operads in $R_K\mathcal{M}$

In this section we assume a little bit more about the colored operad O and less about $\mathcal{M}$ than in Theorem 7.6. The main observation is Theorem 8.5, which says

that R_K preserves O-algebras if O satisfies a certain condition $\star^{\mathsf{O}}$, which is equivalent to O being cofibrant as a colored symmetric sequence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.

Throughout this section, assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibrantly generated model category and that K is a class of cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$. The following lemma is used below to provide necessary conditions for a colored symmetric sequence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ to be cofibrant.

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose:*

- *$R_K\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibrantly generated model category, and G is a finite connected groupoid.*
- *$f \in (R_K\mathcal{M})^G$ is a cofibration, where $(R_K\mathcal{M})^G$ has the inherited projective model structure from $R_K\mathcal{M}$.*

Then:

(1) f is entrywise a cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.
(2) $f \in \mathcal{M}^G$ is a cofibration.

Proof. The first statement follows from [Hir03] (11.6.3).

For the second statement, the cofibrations in $(R_K\mathcal{M})^G$ are generated–as retracts of transfinite compositions of pushouts–by the set $G \cdot \mathsf{I}_K$. Here I_K is the set of generating cofibrations in $R_K\mathcal{M}$, while

$$G \cdot g = \coprod_{G(-,\beta)} g$$

for some object $\beta \in G$ with the coproduct taken in $R_K\mathcal{M}$. Each cofibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is also a cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$, so

$$G \cdot \mathsf{I}_K \subseteq G \cdot \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{cof}}.$$

The cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}$ are generated by the set I of generating cofibrations. Since $G \cdot -$ commutes with taking retracts, transfinite compositions, and pushouts, each cofibration in $(R_K\mathcal{M})^G$ is generated by $G \cdot \mathsf{I}$, which is the set of generating cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}^G$. □

The following observation gives necessary conditions for a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored symmetric sequence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ to be cofibrant.

Proposition 8.2. *Suppose $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists, and $X \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M})$ is cofibrant. Then:*

(1) X is entrywise a K-colocal object in $\mathcal{M}$.
(2) $X \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{M})$ is cofibrant.

Proof. Since (by [WY15] (3.1.5))

$$\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M}) \cong \prod_{\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]} \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathfrak{C}} (R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]} \times \{d\}},$$

X being cofibrant means that each component

$$X\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]} \in (R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\{d\}}$$

is cofibrant. Since each $\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]} \times \{d\}$ is a finite connected groupoid, Lemma 8.1 says that each component $X\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]}$ is

- entrywise cofibrant in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ (i.e., a K-colocal object);
- cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\{d\}}$.

Since we also have

$$\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{M}) \cong \prod_{\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]}\in\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{\mathfrak{C}}\times\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\{d\}},$$

we conclude that $X \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{M})$ is also cofibrant. □

Definition 8.3. Suppose $X \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{M})$. Define the following condition.

> $\star^X$: For each map $p : E \longrightarrow B \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{M})$ that is entrywise both a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$ and a K-colocal equivalence, each solid-arrow diagram
>
> $$\begin{array}{ccc} & & E\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]} \\ & \overset{\cdots\nearrow}{} & \big\downarrow p \\ X\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]} & \longrightarrow & B\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]} \end{array} \tag{8.3.1}$$
>
> in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\{d\}}$ admits a dotted lift for each $\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]} \in \Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{\mathfrak{C}} \times \mathfrak{C}$.

The following observation gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored symmetric sequence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ to be cofibrant.

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists, and $X \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M})$. Then X is cofibrant if and only if $\star^X$ holds.*

Proof. Suppose

$$p : E \longrightarrow B \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M}) \cong \prod_{\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]}\in\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{\mathfrak{C}}\times\mathfrak{C}} (R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\{d\}}$$

is a trivial fibration, i.e., each component in $(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\{d\}}$ is a trivial fibration. This means precisely that p is entrywise a trivial fibration in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ by [Hir03] (11.6.1). In other words, p is entrywise both a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$ (since $\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have the same fibrations) and a K-colocal equivalence (= weak equivalence in $R_K\mathcal{M}$). The object X is cofibrant if and only if for each such p and each diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & E \\ & \overset{\cdots\nearrow}{} & \big\downarrow p \\ X & \longrightarrow & B \end{array}$$

in $\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M})$, a dotted filler exists. Such a dotted filler exists if and only if the diagram (8.3.1) in $(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\{d\}} = \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\{d\}}$ always has a dotted filler for each $\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]} \in \Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{\mathfrak{C}} \times \mathfrak{C}$. This is exactly $\star^X$. □

Theorem 8.5. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ and $R_K\mathcal{M}$ are both cofibrantly generated monoidal model categories.*
- *O is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operad in $\mathcal{M}$ that is cofibrant in $\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M})$.*

Then R_K preserves O-algebras.

Proof. As before we will use Theorem 6.2 with T the monad on $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ associated to the colored operad O. First note that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ exists by assumption.

(1) $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};\mathcal{M})$ inherits a semi-model structure from $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ by Theorem 6.3.1 in [WY15]. This is the case because O being cofibrant in $\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M})$ implies $\mathsf{O} \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{M})$ is cofibrant (by Proposition 8.2(2)).
(2) Likewise, $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};R_K\mathcal{M})$ inherits a semi-model structure from $(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\mathfrak{C}}$ by, once again, Theorem 6.3.1 in [WY15] applied to $R_K\mathcal{M}$ and the fact that $\mathsf{O} \in \mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M})$ is cofibrant.
(3) That the forgetful functor
$$\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O};R_K\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow (R_K\mathcal{M})^{\mathfrak{C}}$$
preserves cofibrant objects is part of Theorem 6.3.1 in [WY15].

□

9. Application: Spaces

In this section we provide applications to right Bousfield localizations in the model category Top.

9.1. **Spaces.** For this entire section Top will denote the category of pointed compactly generated spaces, since Remark 3.1.10 of [Hir03] demonstrates that these are the only interesting right Bousfield localizations. Everything in this section is also true for pointed compactly generated weak Hausdorff spaces, using Proposition 5.10 for the requisite smallness. We will often use the fact that for topological model categories like Top, one can use topological (rather than simplicial) mapping spaces to detect K-colocal equivalences. The following is Lemma 2.3 and 2.5 in [CI04] together with Example 9.1.15 of [Hir03]:

Lemma 9.2. *Let K be a set of cofibrant objects in a topological model category $\mathcal{M}$ such that the pair $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable. Then the set*
$$\Lambda(K) = \left\{A \wedge S^{n-1}_+ \longrightarrow A \wedge D^n_+ \mid A \in K,\, n \geq 0\right\}$$
together with the generating trivial cofibrations J of $\mathcal{M}$ form a set of generating cofibrations of $R_K\mathcal{M}$.

Specializing to the case of $\mathcal{M} = \mathsf{Top}$, we find that \$ (Definition 4.2) is always satisfied.

Theorem 9.3. *Let K be any set of cofibrant objects in* Top *that are small with respect to the cofibrations. Then* (Top, K) *satisfies \$.*

Proof. Suppose f is a K-colocal equivalence. Let A be a domain or codomain of a map in $\Lambda(K) \cup \mathsf{J}$, so A is of the form $K \wedge S^j_+$, $K \wedge D^j_+$, D^j_+, or $(D^j \times I)_+$. First, we argue that when A is contractible \$ is satisfied. We must show $\mathrm{Hom}(A, f)$ is a K-colocal equivalence, which is equivalent to $\mathrm{Hom}(K, \mathrm{Hom}(A, f))$ being a weak homotopy equivalence, where $\mathrm{Hom}(A, X)$ has the compact open topology. This means the following map must be an isomorphism for $t \geq 0$:

$$[S^t, \mathrm{Hom}(K \wedge A, f)] \cong [S^t \wedge K, \mathrm{Hom}(A, f)] \cong [S^t \wedge K, f] \cong [S^t, \mathrm{Hom}(K, f)].$$

The right-most map is an isomorphism because f is a K-colocal equivalence. The middle isomorphism uses that $\mathrm{Hom}(A, f) \simeq f$ because $A \simeq pt$.

Next, we argue that the class of K-colocal equivalences coincides with the class of K'-colocal equivalences, where K' is the closure of K under all suspensions $- \wedge S^m_+$. This is because of the following chain of equivalent statements:

f is a K-colocal equivalence
$\iff \mathrm{Hom}(K, f)$ is a weak equivalence
$\iff [S^t, \mathrm{Hom}(K, f)]$ is an isomorphism for all t
$\iff [S^{t+m}, \mathrm{Hom}(K, f)]$ is an isomorphism for all t, m
$\iff [S^t, \mathrm{Hom}(S^m, \mathrm{Hom}(K, f))]$ is an isomorphism for all t, m
$\iff [S^t, \mathrm{Hom}(K \wedge S^m, f)]$ is an isomorphism for all t, m
$\iff f$ is a K'-colocal equivalence

This implies that K-colocal objects are the same as K'-colocal objects. Observe that the K'-colocal objects contain all objects A of the form $K_0 \wedge S^j_+$ for some $K_0 \in K$. We now prove that \$ holds for such objects. To see that $\mathrm{Hom}(A, f)$ is a K-colocal equivalence, consider

$$\mathrm{Hom}\big(K, \mathrm{Hom}(A, f)\big) \cong \mathrm{Hom}\big(K \wedge S^j_+, \mathrm{Hom}(K_0, f)\big).$$

The map $\mathrm{Hom}(K_0, f)$ is a weak equivalence (hence a K'-colocal equivalence) because f is a K-colocal equivalence. Since $K \wedge S^j_+ \subseteq K'$, we see that $\mathrm{Hom}\big(K, \mathrm{Hom}(A, f)\big)$ is a weak equivalence as required.

Since smashing with a contractible object has no effect, this proves that \$ holds for A of the form $K \wedge S^j_+$ or $K \wedge D^j_+$. □

Remark 9.4. This theorem demonstrates that if one wishes a right Bousfield localization R_K to be monoidal, one may as well right localize with respect to the set $\{\Sigma^m A\}$ over all A in K. So for Top, the smallest right Bousfield localization of Definition 4.1 can be obtained simply by enlarging K in this way, and since this does not change the resulting $R_K\mathcal{M}$, we see again that every right Bousfield localization

is monoidal in Top. Note that the step of introducing K' demonstrates that every right Bousfield localization in Top is stable, even though Top itself is unstable.

Example 9.5 (n-connected covers)**.** Let $K = \{S^m \mid m > n\}$, a set of cofibrant objects that are small relative to the cofibrations. In this case $R_K(X) = CW_A(X)$ where $A = S^n$ [Cha96, Far96]. The K-colocal objects are X with $\pi_{\leq n}(X) = 0$, and the K-colocal equivalences are maps f with $\pi_{>n}(f)$ an isomorphism. In this case, $K' = K$ in the proof above, and when $A = S^k_+ \wedge S^j_+$ for $k > n$ then $S^m_+ \wedge A \cong S^{m+k+j}_+$ is again an element in K, so it is automatic that $\mathrm{Hom}(K, \mathrm{Hom}(A, f))$ is a weak equivalence for any K-colocal equivalence f. Theorems 9.3, 4.3, and 4.5 demonstrate that the pushout product axiom is satisfied in $R_K(\mathsf{Top})$.

Example 9.6. Let A be any CW complex. Using the same reasoning as in the previous example, the right Bousfield localization $R_K(\mathsf{Top})$, where $R_K(X) = CW_A(X)$ as studied by Chachólski and co-authors [Cha96], [CDI02], [CPS04] and Nofech [Nof99], forms a monoidal model category.

An example of this type of colocalization is Mike Cole's mixed model structure on Top, see [MP12] (19.1.9). We now give examples of preservation of algebra structure under colocalization. As we do not know ⧫ holds for Top, we will need to focus on colocalizations and colored operads O for which $\star^{\mathsf{O}}$ holds.

Example 9.7. Let $K = \{S^1\}$ so that K-colocal spaces are precisely those X with $\pi_0(X) = 0$; i.e., X is path connected. The Com operad has $Com(j) = S^0$ for all j, so is not entrywise path connected. Similarly, $\mathrm{Ass}(j) = S^0[\Sigma_j]$ is a coproduct of copies of S^0 so is not path connected. However, an E_∞ operad O does have path connected spaces (contractible even), so such an operad is entrywise K-colocal. It is easy to check that such an operad is in fact Σ-cofibrant in the K-colocal model structure on symmetric sequences, since the fixed-point property of $E\Sigma_n$ guarantees the existence of an equivariant lift in a lifting problem against a K-colocally trivial fibration. It follows that R_K preserves E_∞-algebras. Similarly, the spaces of the A_∞-operad are path connected CW complexes (the Stasheff associahedra), so are K-colocal, but we cannot say that R_K preserves algebras over this operad because we do not know A_∞ is Σ-cofibrant in the K-colocal model structure.

We can also build operads guaranteed to satisfy our criteria.

Example 9.8. Let K be any set of cofibrant objects. For each n, endow Top^{Σ_n} with the projective K-colocal model structure. This is possible because $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrantly generated. Consider the free-operad adjunction

$$\prod_n \mathsf{Top}^{\Sigma_n} \rightleftarrows Op(\mathsf{Top})$$

Fresse's Theorem 12.2.A [Fre10] proves that there is a transferred semi-model structure, since $R_K\mathcal{M}$ has the pushout product axiom, by Theorem 9.3. In fact, it can be made a full model structure following [Rez96], since $R_K\mathcal{M}$ has a nice path object. Let $X = Q_K(Com)$ be the cofibrant replacement of Com in this model structure, as in

[Whi14a]. By construction this operad satisfies $\star^X$, so R_K preserves algebras over this operad.

10. Application: Equivariant Spaces

In this section we provide applications to right Bousfield localizations in the model category Top^G of G-equivariant spaces for a compact Lie group or a finite group G.

Let G be a compact Lie group. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathsf{Top}^G$ denote the category of G-equivariant compactly generated spaces or compactly generated weak Hausdorff spaces. Let Map denote the space of all continuous maps, endowed with the conjugation action by G. This is the internal Hom object. Let Map_G denote the space of G-equivariant maps, endowed with the compact-open topology. This gives the enrichment of Top^G in Top, so we may use Lemma 9.2 with this mapping space. The weak equivalences (resp. fibrations) of Top^G are maps f such that H-fixed points f^H are weak equivalences (resp. fibrations) for all closed subgroups $H < G$. The generating (trivial) cofibrations are

$$\big\{i \wedge (G/H)_+ \mid H < G \text{ closed}\big\}$$

where i is a generating (trivial) cofibration in Top. There is an adjunction

$$\mathsf{Map}_G\big(X \wedge (G/H)_+, f\big) \cong \mathsf{Map}(X, f^H)$$

for any G-space X.

Proposition 10.1. *Suppose that a set K of cofibrant objects in Top^G is closed under the operations $- \wedge S^1$ and $- \wedge (G/H)_+$ for all $H < G$. Then (Top^G, K) satisfies \$ (Definition 4.2).*

Proof. Let f be a K-colocal equivalence. Let A be a domain or codomain of a map in $\Lambda(K) \cup \mathsf{J}$. Then A is of the form $D_+ \wedge (G/H)_+$ where D is in the set

$$\big\{D^j, D^j \wedge I, K_0 \wedge S^j, K_0 \wedge D^j\big\}.$$

over all $K_0 \in K$ and all j. We have argued above that contractible objects do not matter to the homotopy type of an internal hom object. We must prove that the map $\mathsf{Map}_G(B, \mathsf{Map}(A, f))$ is a weak equivalence in Top for all $B \in K$. We use [MM02] (III.1.6):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Map}_G\big(B, \mathsf{Map}(D_+ \wedge (G/H)_+, f)\big) &\cong \mathsf{Map}\big(B, \mathsf{Map}(D_+ \wedge (G/H)_+, f)\big)^G \\ &\cong \mathsf{Map}\big(B, \mathsf{Map}(D_+ \wedge (G/H)_+, f)^G\big) \\ &\cong \mathsf{Map}\Big(B, \mathsf{Map}_G\big(D_+ \wedge (G/H)_+, f\big)\Big)\end{aligned}$$

Because $D_+ \wedge (G/H)_+$ is in K by hypothesis, $\mathsf{Map}_G(D_+ \wedge (G/H)_+, f)$ is a weak equivalence in Top. Forgetting the G-action, we are now trying to prove

$$\mathsf{Map}_G(B, \mathsf{Map}(A, f)) \cong \mathsf{Top}(B, g)$$

is a weak equivalence, where g is a weak equivalence in Top. As B is cofibrant and Top^G is a topological model category, [Hov99] (4.2.3) proves that $\mathsf{Top}(B,-)$ is a right Quillen functor, hence preserves weak equivalences between fibrant objects by Ken Brown's Lemma [Hov99] (1.1.12). We conclude that $\mathsf{Map}_G\big(B,\mathsf{Map}(A,f)\big)$ is a weak equivalence as required. □

The hypotheses of this theorem can always be arranged by enlarging K if necessary. We now record the equivariant analogue of the CW_A functors.

Example 10.2. Suppose A is a cofibrant object in Top^G. Denote the *smash closure* of A by

$$K(A) = \Big\{\Sigma^p A^{\wedge q} \wedge (G/H_1)_+ \wedge \cdots \wedge (G/H_r)_+ \mid p,r \geq 0,\, q \geq 1;\, \text{all } H_k < G\Big\}.$$

Then $K(A)$ satisfies the closure properties in Proposition 10.1, so $(\mathsf{Top}^G, K(A))$ satisfies \$. Note that $K(A)$ is the smallest set of objects containing A that satisfies the closure properties in Proposition 10.1.

Example 10.3. More generally, suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is a non-empty set of cofibrant objects in Top^G. Then the set

$$K(\mathcal{A}) = \Big\{\Sigma^p A_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge A_q \wedge (G/H_1)_+ \wedge \cdots \wedge (G/H_r)_+ \mid p,r \geq 0,\, q \geq 1;\, \text{all } H_k < G; \text{all } A_j \in \mathcal{A}\Big\}$$

satisfies the closure properties in Proposition 10.1, so $(\mathsf{Top}^G, K(\mathcal{A}))$ satisfies \$. In this case, $K(\mathcal{A})$ is the smallest set of objects containing $\mathcal{A}$ that satisfies the closure properties in Proposition 10.1.

We now record several examples unique to the setting Top^G. First, consider the case where G is finite.

Let F be a nonempty set of subgroups of G, and let

$$K(\mathsf{F}) = \big\{(G/H)_+ \mid H \in \mathsf{F}\big\}.$$

A $K(\mathsf{F})$-colocal equivalence is a map f such that

$$\mathsf{Map}_G\big((G/H)_+, f\big) \cong f^H$$

is a weak equivalence in Top for all $H \in \mathsf{F}$. The fibrations in $R_{K(\mathsf{F})}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ are the same as in Top^G, i.e. maps f such that f^H is a fibration in Top for all $H < G$. The generating trivial cofibrations are maps of the form

$$D^j_+ \wedge (G/H)_+ \longrightarrow D^j_+ \wedge I \wedge (G/H)_+$$

for all $j \geq 0$ and all $H < G$. The generating cofibrations are these maps together with maps of the form

$$S^{j-1}_+ \wedge (G/H)_+ \longrightarrow D^j_+ \wedge (G/H)_+$$

for $j \geq 0$ and $H \in \mathsf{F}$. Denote the model category $R_{K(\mathsf{F})}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ by $R_{\mathsf{F}}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$.

Suppose F is a *family*, i.e., closed under conjugation, intersection, and passage to subgroup. Then there is a model structure $\mathsf{Top}^{\mathsf{F}}$ with weak equivalences (resp. fibrations) the maps f such that f^H is a weak equivalence (resp. fibration) in Top for $H \in \mathsf{F}$. The generating (trivial) cofibrations are maps of the form $i \wedge (G/H)_+$ where $H \in \mathsf{F}$ and i is a generating (trivial) cofibration of Top.

Theorem 10.4. *The identity functor* $\mathsf{Top}^{\mathsf{F}} \longrightarrow R_{\mathsf{F}}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ *is a Quillen equivalence. Moreover,* $\mathsf{Top}^{\mathsf{F}}$ *and* $R_{\mathsf{F}}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ *both satisfy the pushout product axiom.*

Proof. First, every fibration of $R_{\mathsf{F}}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ is a fibration of $\mathsf{Top}^{\mathsf{F}}$ because it is easier to satisfy f^H being a fibration for all $H \in \mathsf{F}$ than to satisfy it for all $H < G$. Next, these two model categories have the same weak equivalences, so the identity Quillen adjunction is a Quillen equivalence. Next, $\mathsf{Top}^{\mathsf{F}}$ satisfies the pushout product axiom by Lemma 2.19 in [Fau08]. Fundamentally, this is because G is finite and F is closed under intersection, so $G/H_1 \times G/H_2$ with the diagonal action is cofibrant.

By Theorems 4.3 and 4.5, to see that $R_{\mathsf{F}}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ satisfies the pushout product axiom, it is enough to check that \$ holds for $(\mathsf{Top}^G, K(\mathsf{F}))$. In the current setting, \$ requires the map

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Map}_G\big((G/H)_+, \mathsf{Map}(A, f)\big) &\cong \mathsf{Map}\Big((G/H)_+, \mathsf{Map}(A, f)\Big)^G \\ &\cong \mathsf{Map}\Big((G/H)_+ \wedge A, f\Big)^G \\ &\cong \mathsf{Map}_G\big((G/H)_+ \wedge A, f\big) \\ &\cong \mathsf{Map}\big(A, f^H\big)\end{aligned}$$

to be a weak equivalence whenever f is a $K(\mathsf{F})$-colocal equivalence, $H \in \mathsf{F}$ (so $(G/H)_+ \in K(\mathsf{F})$), and A a (co)domain of a map in $\Lambda(K(\mathsf{F})) \cup \mathsf{J}$. Since $H \in \mathsf{F}$ and f is a $K(\mathsf{F})$-colocal equivalence, the map f^H is a weak equivalence in Top (necessarily between fibrant objects). Moreover, since every choice of A is cofibrant, $\mathsf{Map}(A, f^H)$ is a weak equivalence as well by Ken Brown's Lemma [Hov99] (1.1.12). □

Remark 10.5. This Proposition remains true when G is a compact Lie group, but all subgroups should be closed and $\mathsf{Top}^{\mathsf{F}}$ is only a monoidal model category if F is an Illman collection, which is automatic in the case when G is finite. See Lemma 2.19 in [Fau08] for more details.

Example 10.6. When $\mathsf{F} = \{e\}$ we obtain a model structure on Top^G Quillen equivalent to the *coarse model structure*, where f is a weak equivalence if it is so when viewed in Top. However, $R_{\{e\}}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ has fewer fibrations and more cofibrations, allowing equivariant cells as well as the usual cells of Top.

Example 10.7. When $\mathsf{F} = \{G\}$, $R_{\mathsf{F}}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ is a new model structure on Top^G where a map f is a weak equivalence if and only if f^G is a weak homotopy equivalence in Top.

We are prepared to give examples of preservation of algebraic structure under colocalization. We can mimic Example 9.8 to put a model structure on the category of G-equivariant operads transferred from the projective model structure on $\prod_n (\mathsf{Top}^G)^{\Sigma_n}$. In this model structure we can take the cofibrant replacement of Com, and it is an equivariant E_∞-operad, which we shall call $\mathcal{E}$. This operad plays an important role in the search for algebraic models for equivariant spectra. We will show a preservation result for this operad. Note, however, that this is the wrong operad to encode complete equivariant commutativity (including norms) in G-spectra, because it does not allow for mixing of the G-action with the Σ_n-action. The correct operads to study for norms are the N_∞-operads of [BH14].

Example 10.8. The colocalizations $K(F)$ above preserve algebras over the operad $\mathcal{E}$. This is because $\mathcal{E}$ is Σ-cofibrant in $\prod_n (\mathsf{Top}^G)^{\Sigma_n}$ and in $\prod_n \mathsf{Top}^{\Sigma_n}$, after forgetting the G-action, so $\mathcal{E}$-algebras inherit a semi-model structure in any (G-)topological model category. The model $R_{K(F)}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ is a topological model category, as can readily be seen by following the proof in [Hir03] that any right Bousfield localization of a simplicial model category is simplicial. We have already shown this $R_{K(F)}$ is an *enriched* colocalization in the sense of [Gut12], so it should not come as a surprise that the resulting model category $R_{K(F)}(\mathsf{Top}^G)$ is also enriched. With this semi-model structure in hand, we can easily prove $R_{K(F)}$ preserves $\mathcal{E}$-algebras, following Theorem 8.5.

Example 10.9. Let $K = \{S^{n+1}\}$, so that K-colocal objects are n-connected covers. Then both the operad $\mathcal{E}$ and the N_∞ operads of [BH14] are objectwise K-colocal and Σ_n-free. They therefore satisfy $\star^{\mathsf{O}}$, and hence their algebras are preserved by taking n-connected covers.

11. Application: Chain Complexes

In this section we provide applications to right Bousfield localizations in the model category of chain complexes of modules over a commutative ring R. Colocalizations in these contexts are well-studied, as examples below will demonstrate. Recall the projective model structure on $\mathsf{Ch}_{\geq 0}(R)$ from [DS95]. This model structure is combinatorial, closed symmetric monoidal, and all objects are bifibrant, i.e. both fibrant and cofibrant. Recall also the projective model structure on unbounded chain complexes $\mathsf{Ch}(R)$ from [Hov99]. This model structure is combinatorial, closed symmetric monoidal, and has all objects fibrant. Lastly, recall from [Hess07] the category $\mathsf{Ch}^{\geq 0}(k)$ of non-negatively graded cochain complexes. It is combinatorial, closed symmetric monoidal, and has all objects fibrant. There are also formally dual non-positively graded chain complexes, cochain complexes, and unbounded cochain complexes.

In all three cases let $S(n)$ be the chain complex with R in degree n and 0 everywhere else, and let $D(n)$ be the chain complex with R in degrees n and $n-1$ (or $n+1$ for cochain complexes), 0 otherwise, and the identity map as the differential

d_n. The monoidal product $\otimes$ is defined by

$$(C_\bullet \otimes D_\bullet)_n = \bigoplus_{i+j=n} (C_i \otimes_R D_j)$$

and the internal Hom is defined by

$$\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y)_n = \prod_k \mathrm{Hom}_R(X_k, Y_{n+k})$$

We will record several examples of colocalizations in these settings.

Example 11.1. If A is an object of $\mathcal{M}$ then colocalization with respect to $K = \{A\}$ gives CW_A by analogy with Example 9.6, and this can be viewed as A-cellular homological algebra. $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is the model categorical analogue of the localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(R)$ generated by A, i.e. the smallest subcategory containing A and closed under retracts and coproducts. This is the subcategory generated by A under homotopy colimits.

An example of this type of colocalization is the mixed model structure on $\mathsf{Ch}(R)$ from [MP12] (19.1.10).

Example 11.2. Let $K = \{S(n)\}$ for some n. Then the K-colocal objects are the X such that $H_{<n}(X) = 0$, and the K-colocal equivalences are maps f such that $H_{\geq n}(f)$ is an isomorphism. The functor R_K can be viewed as an n-connected cover. Of course, this example is a special case of the above, and demonstrates that $R_K\mathcal{M} = R_{K'}(\mathcal{M})$ for $K' = \{S(m) \mid m \geq n\}$.

Example 11.3. To any localization in $\mathcal{M}$ at a set of maps S, we can assign a colocalization with respect to the cofibers of S as in [BR14] (9.2). The resulting triangles $R_K(X) \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow L_S(X)$ are much studied in the theory of triangulated categories, see [Nee01], [HPS97].

We learned the following two examples from Bill Dwyer.

Example 11.4. Let R be the integers and p be a prime number. There is a colocalization such that X is colocal precisely when $H_i(X)$ is p-torsion for all i. More generally, the authors of [BR14] study the monoidal properties of the analogous colocalization of a general commutative ring R and a perfect R-module A. In this setting the colocal objects are the A-torsion R-modules.

Example 11.5. Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R. There is a colocalization such that X is colocal precisely when for all i and all $x \in H_i(X)$, there is some integer k with $I^k x = 0$. This allows for the study of local cohomology at I using colocalization.

In addition, in [Bau02] and [Bau99], Bauer developed machinery to lift colocalizations of chain complexes to categories of spectra, giving yet another application of colocalizations for chain complexes.

Lemma 11.6. *Let K be a set of cofibrant objects in any of our models $\mathcal{M}$ of (co)chain complexes such that the pair $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable. Then the set*

$$\Lambda(K) = \left\{ A \otimes_R S(n-1) \longrightarrow A \otimes_R D(n) \mid A \in K \right\}$$

together with the generating trivial cofibrations J of $\mathcal{M}$ form a set of generating cofibrations of $R_K\mathcal{M}$. Here n runs through all degrees of complexes in $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. That these maps detect fibrations between fibrant objects by lifting is Lemma 2.3 of [CI04], and already appears in [Hir03] (Ch. 5). To see that these maps provide a factorization system, proceed exactly as in the proof of Lemma 2.5 of [CI04], but replacing $\Delta[n]$ everywhere by $D(n)$ and replacing $\partial\Delta[n]$ by $S(n-1)$. This proof boils down to the small object argument, which is guaranteed to stop because $\mathcal{M}$ is combinatorial. Indeed, all that is required in order for Christensen-Isaksen's Hypothesis 2.4 to hold is that the domains of J are small relative to the cofibrations. □

Theorem 11.7. *Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathsf{Ch}(R)$ denote any of our categories of chain complexes. Then every right Bousfield localization $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is monoidal, i.e. satisfies Condition \$.*

Proof. Let f be a K-colocal equivalence, $B \in K$, and let A be a domain or codomain of a map in $\Lambda(K) \cup J$. We must show that $\mathrm{Hom}(B, \mathrm{Hom}(A, f))$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Here A has the form $C \otimes_R S(n), C \otimes_R D(n), D(n)$, or 0, where $C \in K$. Since tensoring with a contractible object does not change anything, we are reduced to the case $A = C$ and $A = C \otimes_R S(n)$. For $A = C$ we know that $\mathrm{Hom}(C, f)$ is a quasi-isomorphism because $C \in K$ and f is a K-colocal equivalence. For $A = C \otimes_R S(n)$, proceed as in the proof of Theorem 9.3 and note that R_K is the same as $R_{K'}$ where $K' = \{W \otimes S(n) \mid W \in K, n = 1, 2, ...\}$ is the stabilization of K under shift suspension. To see that the class of K-colocal equivalences coincides with the class of K'-colocal equivalences, use the following chain of equivalent statements:

f is a K-colocal equivalence
$\iff \mathrm{Hom}(K, f)$ is a quasi-isomorphism
$\iff H_t(\mathrm{Hom}(K, f))$ is an isomorphism for all t
$\iff [S(t), \mathrm{Hom}(K, f)]_{\mathsf{Ch}(R)}$ is an isomorphism for all t
$\iff [S(t) \otimes S(m), \mathrm{Hom}(K, f)]_{\mathsf{Ch}(R)}$ is an isomorphism for all t, m
$\iff [S(t), \mathrm{Hom}(S(m), \mathrm{Hom}(K, f))]_{\mathsf{Ch}(R)}$ is an isomorphism for all t, m
$\iff [S(t), \mathrm{Hom}(K \otimes S(m), f)]_{\mathsf{Ch}(R)}$ is an isomorphism for all t, m
$\iff \mathrm{Hom}(K \otimes S(m), f)$ is a quasi-isomorphism for all m
$\iff f$ is a K'-colocal equivalence

This implies that K-colocal objects are the same as K'-colocal objects. Since $C \otimes_R S(n)$ is in K', $C \otimes_R S(n)$ is K-colocal. So $\mathrm{Hom}(C \otimes_R S(n), f)$ and

$$\mathrm{Hom}\Big(B, \mathrm{Hom}(C \otimes_R S(n), f)\Big)$$

are quasi-isomorphisms as required. □

Remark 11.8. Stable and monoidal right Bousfield localizations have been studied in [BR14]. There, stability means the class of K-colocal equivalences is closed under suspension, while the class of K-colocal objects is closed under desuspension. Our notion is different, and appears to be satisfied more frequently. To [BR14], a monoidal right Bousfield localization has K closed under the monoidal product. They prove that $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is stable and monoidal if K and $\mathcal{M}$ are stable and monoidal. As Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 6.2 in [BR14] are both 'if and only if' results, our Theorem recovers theirs in case $\mathcal{M}$ is stable and K is closed under desuspension.

We now record the dual of Proposition 7.5 in [Whi14b].

Proposition 11.9. *Let k be a field of characteristic zero. The only right Bousfield localizations of $\mathsf{Ch}(k)_{\geq 0}$ are n-connected covers as in Example 11.2.*

Proof. Over any principal ideal domain, the homotopy type is determined by H_*, so this means adding weak equivalences is equivalent to nullifying some object. All objects are coproducts of spheres $S(j)$, and killing k^2 in degree n is the same as killing k in degree n. Thus, the colocalization is completely determined by the highest dimension in which the first nullification occurs. The colocalization is therefore equivalent to $R_K\mathcal{M}$ for $K = \{S(n)\}$ for that highest dimension n. □

In [Whi14b] an example demonstrated that a left localization of unbounded chain complexes could fail to be monoidal. There does not appear to be a corresponding example for right localizations, leading to the conclusion that it is easier for $R_K\mathcal{M}$ to satisfy the pushout product axiom than for a left localization. However, it is more difficult for R_K to preserve operad-algebra structure than for a left localization to do so, as the following example shows.

Example 11.10. For $\mathcal{M}$ any of our categories of chain complexes, there is a right Bousfield localization that destroys monoid structure. Consider the first connective cover functor R_K for $K = \{S(1)\}$. The K-colocal objects X have $H_{\leq n}(X) = 0$ and a K-colocal equivalence is a map f inducing an isomorphism on $H_{>n}(f)$.

This colocalization fails to preserve algebraic structure, even over a Σ-cofibrant operad in $\mathcal{M}$. For example, suppose A is a (unital) differential graded algebra. Then A has a unit map $\eta : S(0) \longrightarrow A$ and a multiplication $\mu : A \otimes_R A \longrightarrow A$ such that $S(0) \otimes_R A \longrightarrow A \otimes_R A \longrightarrow A$ is an isomorphism. However, $R_K(A)$ cannot have a DGA structure because the unit map $S(0) \longrightarrow R_K(A)$ is nullhomotopic, since $H_0(R_K(A)) = 0$. It follows that $S(0) \otimes_R R_K(A) \longrightarrow R_K(A)$ is nullhomotopic, and not an isomorphism.

Remark 11.11. In this example, the operad A_∞ is not objectwise K-colocal. We are about to prove that this is the only way a right localization of chain complexes can fail to preserve structure. If we restrict attention to non-unital DGAs then the operad *is* K-colocal for $K = \{S(1)\}$ so this colocalization preserves non-unital DGAs.

Theorem 11.12. *Let k be a field of characteristic zero and $\mathcal{M} = \mathsf{Ch}(k)$ be any of our categories of chain complexes. Then $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies ⧫. Furthermore, for any colored operad O valued in $\mathcal{M}$, O satisfies $\star^{\mathsf{O}}$ if O is objectwise K-colocal.*

By Theorem 8.5 we deduce

Corollary 11.13. *For any of our categories of chain complexes over a field of characteristic zero, and any set of cofibrant objects K, R_K preserves O-algebras for any colored operad O that is objectwise K-colocal.*

Proof of Theorem 11.12. Since k has characteristic zero, all symmetric sequences are projectively cofibrant in the model category $\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathcal{M})$ by Maschke's Theorem. This is because every module with a Σ_n-action (i.e. every $X \in \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_n}$) is Σ_n-free. The same reasoning shows that K-colocal objects X in $(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma_n}$ have Σ_n-equivariant lifts against fibrations, because the characteristic zero assumption guarantees the Σ_n-equivariance is no obstacle. So ⧫ holds. For the second part, let O be objectwise K-colocal. Then O is projectively cofibrant in $\mathsf{SymSeq}_{\mathfrak{C}}(R_K\mathcal{M})$, because each $\mathsf{O}\binom{d}{[\underline{c}]}$ is projectively cofibrant in $(R_K\mathcal{M})^{\Sigma_n}$. □

Example 11.14. For any of the n-connected cover colocalizations of Example 11.2, R_K preserves algebras over any E_∞ operad O, when k has characteristic zero. This is because all spaces $\mathsf{O}(n)$ have $H_i(\mathsf{O}(n)) = 0$ for all i, hence are K-colocal. Similarly, commutative differential graded algebras are preserved.

Example 11.15. Suppose $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable and that the K-colocalization functor can be chosen to be lax monoidal (e.g. see [Gut12] (5.6)). Then for any colored operad O, the sequence $R_K\mathsf{O}$ defined by

$$(R_K\mathsf{O})\tbinom{d}{[\underline{c}]} = R_K\left(\mathsf{O}\tbinom{d}{[\underline{c}]}\right)$$

is a colored operad over $R_K\mathcal{M}$. By construction, this colored operad is objectwise K-colocal, so R_K preserves algebras over $R_K\mathsf{O}$.

Note that this example is more difficult for topological spaces, because in that setting $R_K\mathsf{O}$ need not be Σ-cofibrant even if O is.

Example 11.16. Suppose $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is right localizable and satisfies $. Consider the adjunction given by the free operad functor

$$\prod_{n\geq 0} \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_n} \rightleftarrows Op(\mathcal{M})$$

Give $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_n}$ the projective K-colocal model structure. This is possible because the K-colocal model structure is cofibrantly generated. Fresse's Theorem 12.2.A [Fre10] gives a transferred semi-model structure on $Op(\mathcal{M})$, and for $\mathcal{M} = \mathsf{Ch}(k)$ this can be made into a full model structure by Theorem 6.1.1 of [Hin97], using the fact that k has characteristic zero. The operad Com is defined to be the operad with $Com(n) = k$ for all n. Let $X = Q_K(Com)$ be the cofibrant replacement of Com in this transferred model structure, as in [Whi14a]. By construction this operad satisfies $\star^X$, and hence R_K preserves $Q_K(Com)$-algebras.

Remark 11.17. Returning to Example 11.10 we see that the failure of R_K to preserve differential graded structure is due to the fact that both the associative operad and the A_∞ operad do not have K-colocal spaces. Recall that $A_\infty(j) = k[\Sigma_j]$, hence has non-trivial homology. Similarly, the colored operad whose algebras are $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operads will not be preserved by n-connected covers for $n < |\mathfrak{C}|$.

11.18. **Equivariant Chain Complexes.** The previous material can be generalized to the equivariant setting in the same way we generalized from Top to Top^G. Now G is a group acting on R and on all R-modules. A cofibrantly generated, monoidal model structure can be placed on $\mathsf{Ch}(R)^G$ with all objects fibrant. The authors are unaware of any papers studying this model structure, let alone colocalizations therein. We believe this is a valuable example to develop intuition about equivariant spectra, an important example not included in our theory because not all objects are fibrant. Furthermore, we wonder if Bauer's work in [Bau99] and [Bau02] could be generalized to this setting, so that equivariant colocalizations of chains would lift to the level of spectra.

11.19. **Simplicial Abelian Groups.** The category of simplicial abelian groups has a cofibrantly generated model structure [Qui67] in which all objects are fibrant. This category is equivalent to the category of bounded below chain complexes, by the Dold-Kan Theorem. The normalized chains functor N is a natural isomorphism, compatible with the model structures, and is monoidal by [SS03] (4.1).

It follows that all our preservation results about chain complexes hold in this setting as well. In particular, every right localizable $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ satisfies \$, a host of examples is given above, and for any colored operad O whose spaces are all K-colocal, R_K preserves O algebras.

12. Application: Stable Module Category

In this section we provide applications to right Bousfield localizations in the stable module category. The stable module category is a triangulated category of R-modules much studied in representation theory [Hap88]. Here R is a quasi-Frobenius ring (i.e. projective modules and injective modules coincide), and projective modules have been set to zero. Equivalently, two maps are homotopic if their difference factors through a projective module. The triangulated structure is given by defining, for a given R-module M, $\Omega(M)$ to be the kernel of a map from a projective onto M; the inverse Ω^{-1} is the cokernel of $M \longrightarrow I$ for I injective. This category is the homotopy theory of a combinatorial model category where all objects are bifibrant [Hov99] (2.2). If R is of the form $k[G]$ where k is a principal ideal domain and G a finite group, then [Hov02] (9.5) proves this model category is a monoidal model category satisfying the monoid axiom of [SS00].

We focus on the case $R = k[G]$ for a field k, and denote the model structure on R-mod by $\mathcal{M}$. Unlike our work on chain complexes, we now do *not* want k to have

characteristic zero. If it did, then all modules would be projective, so the stable module category would be trivial. The only interesting case is the modular case, where the characteristic of k divides the order of G. The primary operads of interest here are the associative and commutative operads, which encode associative R-algebras and commutative R-algebras, respectively.

Colocalizations have been studied in this context in [BIK11], [Rez97], [BCR95], [BCR96], [BR07] (for Torsion theories), [BGH14], [Sha11] and [GS14], and in highly related contexts in [IKM12] and [BN93] (Section 6). In this setting, there is a relationship between colocalization and localization functors as in Example 11.3, and it now gives a natural equivalence between such functors [HPS97] (3.1.6). Additionally, these localization-colocalization pairs are intimately related to recollements.

Example 4.1 of [Whi14b] demonstrates that not every left Bousfield localization of $\mathcal{M}$ is monoidal. Thus, we do not expect every right Bousfield localization of $\mathcal{M}$ to be monoidal. Corollary 1.2 of [BIK12] gives a bijective correspondence between monoidal left localizations and monoidal right localizations, so in fact we know there *must* be an example where the pushout product axiom fails for $R_K\mathcal{M}$. A candidate would be colocalization with respect to the cofiber of the map from Example 4.1 of [Whi14b]. To avoid such examples, we shall assume condition \$ for the remainder of the section.

Example 12.1. The colocalization of [Rez97] (5.8) with respect to a tensor ideal subcategory, satisfies \$ by construction. See Theorem 5.19 of [Rez97].

Theorem 12.2. *The model $\mathcal{M}$ for the stable module category satisfies ♣. In particular, it satisfies the strong commutative monoid axiom from* [Whi14a]. *Furthermore, for any right localizable, stable K satisfying \$, $R_K(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies ♣.*

Proof. Let X be an R-module with a Σ_n-action. Cofibrations are monomorphisms, so the functor $X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} (-)^{\square n}$ automatically preserves cofibrations. We must prove it preserves trivial cofibrations. For any trivial cofibration f, $f^{\square n} : A \longrightarrow B$ is a trivial cofibration. Let C be the cokernel of this map, and note that C is nullhomotopic. Apply the functor $X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} (-)$. Since this functor preserves projective modules, it also preserves all nullhomotopic objects of $\mathcal{M}$ because they are generated by the projectives. Since $X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} (-)$ is a left adjoint, $X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} C$ is the cokernel of $X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} A \longrightarrow X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} B$, and so this map is a weak equivalence as required. The strong commutative monoid axiom is the special case $X = k$, the unit of $\mathcal{M}$.

For the "furthermore" part, note that because $\mathcal{M}$ is a combinatorial, stable model category in which all objects are bifibrant, we could just as easily work with its underlying presentable, stable ∞-category. There is a presentable, stable ∞-category whose weak equivalences are the K-colocal equivalences, and where they are detected by cofibers by stability. The proof above then demonstrates that $X \otimes_{\Sigma_n} (-)$ preserves the K-colocal equivalences. To see that it preserves K-colocal cofibrations, it is enough that it preserves K-colocal objects. This is easy to verify, since the property of being K-colocal is detected using homotopy function complexes. □

The following is a formal consequence of the theorem, though of course direct proofs are also possible.

Corollary 12.3. *There are combinatorial stable model category structures on algebras over any colored operad in $\mathcal{M} = k[G]$-mod, wherein maps that factor through a projective module are null. Furthermore:*

(1) In these model categories, all objects are fibrant. In particular, the categories of associative $k[G]$-algebras and of commutative $k[G]$-algebras have model structures.
(2) For any right localizable, stable K satisfying \$, algebras over any entrywise K-colocal colored operad in $R_K\mathcal{M}$ have transferred semi-model structures. If the associative (resp. commutative) operad is entrywise colocal, then there is a full model structure on its category of algebras in $R_K\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Let O be any colored operad in $\mathcal{M}$. As all objects are cofibrant, O is entrywise cofibrant, so Theorem 6.2.3 of [WY15] proves there is a transferred semi-model structure over $\mathcal{M}$. Since all objects in $\mathcal{M}$ are cofibrant, that semi-model structure is a model structure. In these model structures, a map f is a weak equivalence or fibration if it is so in $\mathcal{M}$. The proof for $R_K\mathcal{M}$ is similar, but we use Theorem 7.5 to prove that the transferred semi-model structure exists. For for associative operad, we use [BR14] (6.2) to deduce the monoid axiom for $R_K\mathcal{M}$, and the main result of [SS00] for the claimed model structure. For the commutative operad, we use the main result of [Whi14a], since $R_K\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the commutative monoid axiom and the monoid axiom. □

Example 12.4. Let $\mathcal{M} = k[G]$-mod and let $K = \{k\}$ where k has the trivial G action. The colocalization of $(\mathcal{M}, K)$ is studied in [BR07] (IV.2.7). Since k is the monoidal unit, the commutative operad is objectwise K-colocal. Let K' denote the stable, monoidal closure of K, following [BR14]. Then $R_{K'}$ preserves commutative monoids. Let K'' be the closure of K' and $\{k[\Sigma_n] \mid n = 1, 2, ...\}$. Then $R_{K''}$ preserves both commutative monoids and associative monoids.

We conclude this section by pointing out several other potential applications of our main results in algebraic settings.

Remark 12.5. The paper [IKM12] conducts colocalization in the model category of [JJ06], for Kasparov K-theory. An interesting open problem is whether or not this model category is monoidal, and whether or not that colocalization preserves algebraic structure. Similarly, [Bec14] proved that the degreewise injective model structure on Ch(R) of [Gil08] is a right Bousfield localization of the Inj model structure of [BGH14]. If the Inj model structure is monoidal, our work gives a new approach to studying the monoidal properties of the degreewise injective model structure. Lastly, [Mur07] considered a colocalization with respect to local cohomology in the category of quasi-coherent sheaves over a scheme X. This is a monoidal model category by [Gil06], and one could therefore ask about preservation of algebraic structure by this colocalization.

13. Application: Small Categories

The category Cat of small categories possesses a combinatorial, simplicial, Cartesian model structure called the *canonical* (or *folk*) model structure [Rez96]. The weak equivalences are the equivalences of categories, and all objects are bifibrant. Commonly studied operads in this setting include the categorical Barrat-Eccles operad and the A_∞ operad, whose algebras are A_∞-categories. The path object of Cat can be used to construct model structures for these categories of algebras, following [Rez96]. Since Cat is simplicial, \$ can easily be verified as we did for topological spaces.

For any colocalization R_K chosen, model structures on algebras over the Barrat-Eccles operad or the A_∞-operad can be constructed as for the stable module category; since all objects are cofibrant there will be no difference between a semi-model structure over Cat and a full model structure. Thus, $\clubsuit$ and $\star^X$ need not be verified, and we will have preservation results over any colored operad that is entrywise K-colocal.

A notion of suspension in Cat has recently been invented in [Vic15]. It should therefore be possible to define n-connected covers as a colocalization, and one can mimic the theory of topological spaces and chain complexes to determine what types of algebraic structure are preserved. Since the Barrat-Eccles operad is contractible, such colocalizations should preserve algebras over it.

Another colocalization in this setting is A-cellularization for some category or set of categories A, by analogy with Top. The description on pages 37-39 of [Vic15] give a hands-on way to do such cellularization, replacing her T by some category A. In particular, A can be chosen in such a way that either of the operads above consist of A-colocal spaces.

Remark 13.1. There are several examples similar to Cat, where preservation results of this sort could be proven. For example, the (folk) model structure on the category of groupoids and the (folk) model structure on set-valued operads are both combinatorial, Cartesian, and have all objects fibrant. A vast generalization of all three is given by the model structure [EKV05] of categories internal to some category $\mathcal{C}$. In this cofibrantly generated model structure, all objects are fibrant, and a monoidal product is inherited from $\mathcal{C}$ (just as Cat inherits the Cartesian structure from Set). All of these examples have colocalization functors and operads, so the question of preservation may be studied therein.

References

[BR14] David Barnes and Constanze Roitzheim. Stable left and right Bousfield localisations. *Glasg. Math. J.*, 56(1):13–42, 2014. 34, 36, 40

[Bar10] Clark Barwick. On left and right model categories and left and right Bousfield localizations. *Homology, Homotopy Appl.*, 12(2):245–320, 2010. 12

[BB14] Michael Batanin and Clemens Berger. Homotopy theory for algebras over polynomial monads, preprint available electronically from http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.0086. 2014. 2

[Bau99] F. Bauer, The Boardman category of spectra, chain complexes and (co-)localizations, Homology Homotopy Appl. (1), 95-116, 1999 34, 38

[Bau02] F. Bauer, Colocalizations and their realizations as spectra, Theory Appl. Categ. 10 (8) 162-179, 2002. 34, 38

[Bec14] H. Becker, Models for Singularity Categories, Adv. Math 254, 187-232, 2014. 40

[BR07] A. Beligiannis and I. Reiten, Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 188 (883), 2007 39, 40

[BCR95] D. Benson, J. Carlson, J. Rickard, Complexity and varieties for infinitely generated modules, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 118 (2), 223-243, 1995. 39

[BCR96] D. Benson, J. Carlson, J. Rickard, Complexity and varieties for infinitely generated modules. II, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 120 (4), 597-615, 1996. 39

[BIK11] D. Benson, S. Iyengar, H. Krause, Stratifying modular representations of finite groups, Ann. of Math. (2) 174 (3), 1643-1684, 2011. 39

[BIK12] D. Benson, S. Iyengar, H. Krause, Colocalizing subcategories and cosupport, J. Reine Angew. Math. 673, 161-207, 2012 39

[BM03] C. Berger and I. Moerdijk, Axiomatic homotopy theory for operads, Comment. Math. Helv. 78 (2003) 805-831. 15, 16

[BM07] C. Berger and I. Moerdijk, Resolution of coloured operads and rectification of homotopy algebras, Contemp. Math. 431 (2007), 31-58. 2, 15, 16

[BH14] Andrew J. Blumberg and Michael A. Hill. Operadic multiplications in equivariant spectra, norms, and transfers, preprint, http://arxiv.org/abs/1309.1750. 2014. 33

[BN93] M. Bökstedt and A. Neeman, Homotopy limits in triangulated categories, Compositio Math. 86 (2), 209-234, 1993 39

[Bor94] F. Borceux, Handbook of categorical algebra 2, categories and structures, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK.

[BGH14] D. Bravo, J. Gillespie, M. Hovey, The stable module category of a general ring, arXiv:1405.5768, 2014 39, 40

[CRT14] C. Casacuberta, O. Raventós, A. Tonks, Comparing Localizations across Adjunctions, arxiv 1404.7340. 21, 22

[CCS07] N. Castellana, J. Crespo, and J. Scherer, On the cohomology of highly connected covers of finite Hopf spaces, Adv. Math 215 (1), 250–262, 2007 2

[Cha96] W. Chachólski, On the functors CW_A and P_A, Duke Math. J. 84 (3), 599-631, 1996. 2, 29

[CDI02] W. Chachólski, W. Dwyer, M. Intermont, The A-complexity of a space, J. London Math. Soc. (2), 65 (1), 204-222, 2002. 29

[CPS04] W. Chachólski, P.E. Parent, D. Stanley, Cellular generators, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 132 (11), 3397-3409 (electronic), 2004. 2, 29

[CI04] J.D. Christensen and D. Isaksen, Duality and pro-spectra, Alg. Geom. Top., 781-812, 2004. 9, 10, 27, 35

[DS95] W. G. Dwyer and J. Spaliński. Homotopy theories and model categories. In *Handbook of algebraic topology*, pages 73–126. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1995. 33

[EKV05] T. Everaert, R.W. Kieboom, T. Van der Linden, Model structures for homotopy of internal categories, Theory Appl. Categ. 15 (3), 66-94, 2005 41

[Far96] E.D. Farjoun, Cellular Spaces, Null Spaces and Homotopy Localization, Lecture Notes in Math. 1622, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996. 29

[Fau08] Halvard Fausk, *Equivariant homotopy theory for pro-spectra*, Geom. Topol. **12** (2008), no. 1, 103–176. MR 2377247 (2009c:55010) 32

[FMY09] Y. Frégier, M. Markl, and D. Yau, The L_∞-deformation complex of diagrams of algebras, New York J. Math. 15 (2009), 353-392.

[Fre10] B. Fresse, Props in model categories and homotopy invariance of structures, Georgian Math. J. 17 (2010), 79-160. 2, 29, 37

[Gil06] J. Gillespie, The Flat Model Structure on Chain Complexes of Sheaves, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 358 (7), 2855–2874, 2006 40

[Gil08] J. Gillespie, Cotorsion pairs and degreewise homological model structures, Homol. Homotopy Appl 10 (1), 283-304, 2008 40

[Gut12] J. Gutiérrez, Transfer of algebras over operads along Quillen adjunctions, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2), 86 (2), 607–625, 2012. 12, 33, 37

[GR14] J. Gutiérrez and C. Roitzheim, Bousfield localisations along Quillen bifunctors and applications, arXiv:1411.0500 12

[GS14] M. Groth and J. Stovicek, Tilting theory for trees via stable homotopy theory, arXiv:1402.6984, 2014 39

[Hap88] D. Happel, Triangulated categories in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 119, Cambridge University Press, 1988 38

[Har10a] J.E. Harper, Bar constructions and Quillen homology of modules over operads, Algebr. Geom. Topol., 10(1):87–136, 2010.

[Har10b] J.E. Harper, Homotopy theory of modules over operads and non-Σ operads in monoidal model categories, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 214 (2010), 1407-1434. 4

[Hess07] K. Hess, Rational homotopy theory: a brief introduction, Contemp. Math., 436, 175-202, 2007 33

[Hin97] V. Hinich, Homological algebra of homotopy algebra, Comm. Alg. 25 (1997), 3291-3323. 37

[Hir03] P.S. Hirschhorn, Model categories and their localizations, Math. Surveys and Monographs 99, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 2003. 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 33, 35

[Hov99] M. Hovey, Model categories, Math. Surveys and Monographs 63, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 1999. 3, 13, 14, 18, 31, 32, 33, 38

[Hov02] M. Hovey, Cotorsion pairs, model category structures, and representation theory, Math Z. 241 (3), 553–592, 2002 38

[HPS97] Mark Hovey, John H. Palmieri, and Neil P. Strickland. Axiomatic stable homotopy theory. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 128(610):x+114, 1997. 34, 39

[IKM12] H. Inassaridze, T. Kandelaki, R. Meyer, Localisation and colocalisation of triangulated categories at thick subcategories, Math. Scand. 110 (1), 59-74, 2012 39, 40

[JJ06] M. Joachim and M. Johnson, Realizing Kasparov's KK-theory groups as the homotopy classes of maps of a Quillen model category, Contemp. Math 399, 163-197, 2006. 40

[JY09] M.W. Johnson and D. Yau, On homotopy invariance for algebras over colored PROPs, J. Homotopy and Related Structures 4 (2009), 275-315.

[Mac98] S. Mac Lane, Categories for the working mathematician, Grad. Texts in Math. 5, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998. 7

[MSS02] M. Markl, S. Shnider, and J. Stasheff, Operads in Algebra, Topology and Physics, Math. Surveys and Monographs 96, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2002. 2

[MM02] M. A. Mandell and J. P. May. Equivariant orthogonal spectra and S-modules. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 159(755):x+108, 2002. 30

[May72] J.P. May, The geometry of iterated loop spaces, Lecture Notes in Math. 271, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.

[May97] J.P. May, Definitions: operads, algebras and modules, Contemporary Math. 202, p.1-7, 1997.

[MP12] J.P. May and K. Ponto, More concise algebraic topology, University of Chicago Press, 2012. 29, 34

[MM97] C. McGibbon and J. Møller, Connected covers and Neisendorfer's localization theorem, Fund. Math. 152 (3) 211–230, 1997 2

[Mur07] D. Murfet, The mock homotopy category of projectives and Grothendieck duality, PhD thesis, Australian National University, 2007. (online at www.therisingsea.org) 40

[Nee01] A. Neeman, Triangulated categories, Annals of Mathematics Studies 148, Princeton University Press, 2001 34

[Nof99] A. Nofech, A-cellular homotopy theories, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra 141 (3), 249-267, 1999. 2, 29

[Qui67] D. Quillen, Homotopical Algebra, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, No. 43, 1967 38

[Rez96] C.W. Rezk, Spaces of algebra structures and cohomology of operads, Ph.D. thesis, MIT, 1996. 29, 41

[Rez96] C. Rezk, A model category for categories, preprint available electronically from http://www.math.uiuc.edu/~rezk/cat-ho.dvi, 1996 41

[Rez97] J. Rickard, Idempotent modules in the stable category, J. London Math. Soc (2), 56 (1), 149-170, 1997 39

[SS00] S. Schwede and B. Shipley, Algebras and modules in monoidal model categories, Proc. London Math. Soc. 80 (2000), 491-511. 16, 38, 40

[SS03] S. Schwede and B. Shipley, Equivalences of monoidal model categories, Algebr. Geom. Topol. (3) 287-334, 2003 38

[Sha11] S. Shamir, Colocalization functors in derived categories and torsion theories, Homology Homotopy Appl. 13 (1), 75-88, 2011 39

[Vic15] D. Vicinsky, The homotopy calculus of categories and graphs, Ph.D. thesis, available electronically from https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/19283/Vicinsky_oregon_0171A_11298.pdf?sequence=1, 2015 41

[Whi14a] D. White, Model structures on commutative monoids in general model categories, preprint available electronically from http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.6759. 2014. 30, 37, 39, 40

[Whi14b] D. White. Monoidal bousfield localizations and algebras over operads, preprint. 3, 11, 22, 36, 39

[Whi13] David White. A short note on smallness and topological monoids, preprint available electronically from http://personal.denison.edu/~whiteda/research.html. 2013. 18

[WY15] D. White and D. Yau, Bousfield localization and algebras over colored operads, arXiv:1503.06720. 3, 5, 6, 7, 19, 22, 24, 25, 27, 40

[Yau] D. Yau, Colored Operads, Graduate Studies in Math., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, to appear.

[YJ15] D. Yau and M.W. Johnson, A Foundation for PROPs, Algebras, and Modules, Math. Surveys and Monographs 203, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2015. 2, 3

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, DENISON UNIVERSITY, GRANVILLE, OH

E-mail address: david.white@denison.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY AT NEWARK, NEWARK, OH

E-mail address: dyau@math.osu.edu